

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE restless march of Biblical science is continually springing fresh surprises. Conclusions in which we had begun to settle comfortably are being challenged by new discoveries or new interpretations of familiar facts, and many 'assured results' are being rudely shaken. The critics have recently compelled us to reconsider the date of Deuteronomy and the origin of the Psalter—matters on which twenty or thirty years ago there was comparative unanimity; and now comes the turn of Deutero-Isaiah.

Or rather 'the Second Isaiah'; for, with the magnanimity of true scholarship, Professor C. C. TORREY, of Yale University, in his recently published *The Second Isaiah: a New Interpretation* (T. & T. Clark; 15s. net), confesses his preference for the simpler name, 'inasmuch as the prophecy belongs to the man in the street quite as truly as to the scholar in his study.' By Deutero-Isaiah we used to understand the whole of the latter part of the book, from ch. 40 to ch. 66, till Duhm taught us to confine the term to chs. 40 to 55 and to regard chs. 56 to 66 as a separate work written in the century after the Exile, within which the earlier chapters fall. This is the now generally accepted position, the only point at issue being whether the last eleven chapters should be regarded as an original literary unit or a collection of fragments.

Now Professor TORREY comes upon the scene with a 'new interpretation' which shatters to

pieces the prevalent conception of the origin and meaning of the book. He has found it necessary, he tells us, 'in every chapter to controvert the views now universally accepted, showing their inadequacy and explaining the author's intention.' In his 'Ezra Studies,' published eighteen years ago, Dr. TORREY showed his quality as an admirable Semitic scholar with a challenging mind and a more than usually unconventional outlook, and his new book is marked by the same freshness and audacity of treatment. A scholar who can assign the building of Nehemiah's wall to 384 B.C. (p. 110) and the Book of Ezekiel to 230 B.C. (p. 101) does not lack courage. The same courage and originality are evidenced in his treatment of the post-exilic age, which he refuses to regard as an age of decadence and degeneracy. 'The period was one of steady advance, not deterioration, in culture, literature, and religion. . . . This was the golden age of the national poetry, as well as of prophecy' (p. 89).

Besides breadth of scholarship and freshness of mind, Dr. TORREY brings to his task a fine literary sense and a keen appreciation of the literary qualities of the book, alike on its technical and its deeper side. There is a truly refreshing chapter on 'Reconstruction by Meter and Strophe,' in which he holds up to ridicule the liberties which Old Testament scholars have often taken with the text, emending, supplementing, rewriting it, in accordance with views of Hebrew metre which are

often anything but certain and may even be false.

The peril of emending poetry on the basis of too rigid ideas of the principles governing its metrical demands is illustrated by a finely satirical reconstruction of 'Crossing the Bar,' accompanied by some amusing mimicry of the argumentation commonly employed by critics. Subjected to this treatment, the third verse emerges thus :

Twilight at first, and evening bell,
And after that the dark !
And may there be no sad farewell,
When I at last embark.

This is more than clever ; it is illuminating.

Without appreciation there can be no true criticism, and Professor TORREY also brings this indispensable quality to his discussion. He can scarcely find terms strong enough to express his admiration for 'the Second Isaiah,' whether as poet or prophet. He is 'the greatest prophet of the ancient world' (p. 218), 'one of the greatest men of antiquity' (p. 39), 'also a born poet, and in his own sphere he is supreme and unrivalled among the great poets of the world' (p. 91). His book is not only 'beyond question the greatest and most original specimen of Hebrew poetry, or of Hebrew prophecy, that has come down to us' (p. 52), but 'the greatest single poetical work of any age' (p. x), and 'a landmark in the history of human thought' (p. 134).

Obviously a man so equipped as Professor TORREY with scholarship, historical sense, literary feeling, and religious insight has a right to be heard when he challenges current critical opinion. He challenges that opinion at every point. He does not believe that chs. 56-66 should be separated from chs. 40-55, but that together, prefaced by chs. 34 and 35, they form a homogeneous whole, issued at one time and in one volume, and composed in the order in which they now stand. He does not believe that the so-called 'Songs of the Servant of Jahweh' are independent and separable from their context, but that each is 'part and parcel of the chapter in

which it stands.' Above all, he does not believe that even chs. 40-48—still less chs. 49-55, which contain no direct or indirect allusion to Cyrus, or to any particular land of exile—were written in Babylon in the sixth century B.C., near the close of the so-called 'Babylonian exile' (540 B.C.), or that they have for their principal themes the glorification of Cyrus, and the Return of the Jews from Babylonia to Jerusalem.

This, it will be admitted, is a sufficiently drastic challenge. What he does believe is that the Second Isaiah composed these poems—all of them, chs. 34 f., 40-66—not long after the year 407 ; we may take for convenience the round number 400 B.C.' (p. 109) ; that they were written in Palestine, presumably in Jerusalem, at a time when the Second Temple had long been in existence and the people were there maintaining the ancient forms of their cult, however unworthily and half-heartedly ; and that 'the people whom he addresses are in their own land, and there is in his words no hint that they, or any portion of them, have ever been anywhere else' (p. 53).

As we call to mind the definite allusions in the prophecy to Cyrus and Babylon on which the case rests for the Babylonian origin and the date about 540 B.C., we stare with astonishment and ask on what authority evidence so palpable is to be dismissed. It is in his treatment of this point that Professor TORREY goes his entirely new way. He believes that all these allusions are later interpolations—the allusions to Cyrus in 44²⁸ (which is in any case admittedly an overloaded verse) and 45¹, and the allusions to Babylon and Chaldea in 43¹⁴ 48¹⁴ and 48²⁰. Undoubtedly the excision of Babylon and the Chaldeans greatly improves and clarifies 43¹⁴, which Dr TORREY renders, 'For your sake I will send and bring all the fugitives, exulting, in their ships'—the reference to the 'ships' (which many scholars needlessly emend) suggesting that the Jewish exiles are not in Babylon, but in places from which they could return to Judea by sea. In point of fact, it cannot be denied that more than once the people are represented as settled all over the world, in the east, west, north, and south

(cf. 43⁵¹). In other words, it is the later Dispersion, not the Babylonian exile, that the prophet has in view, and the most fitting description of him is 'the Prophet of the Dispersion.'

This is the calamity which had brought dismay to every loyal son of Israel—not the deportation of a few thousand Jews to Babylonia, but the dispersion of the nation to the four corners of the world, with the consequent danger of its assimilation to idolatrous practices and of the frustration of Israel's mission. The prophet is really combating the threatened dissolution of Israel.

But the reason which makes it certain that those proper names which point so definitely to a Babylonian origin are intrusions is based on metrical considerations: the suspected words interfere with the metre. In 45¹, for example, the word *l'Kôresh* (to Cyrus), on which our whole interpretation of the Second Isaiah turns, is metrically superfluous, as a glance at Cheyne's edition of the Hebrew is enough to show. So argues Professor TORREY; and for the same reason the other proper names fall under the same suspicion.

There can be no doubt that this argument compels a reconsideration of the problem of the book. It is also strengthened by the fact, on which Dr. TORREY justly enough lays stress (p. 42), that explanatory interpolations do undoubtedly occur elsewhere in the Old Testament: for example, in Is 7^{17, 20} 'the king of Assyria' is a manifest intrusion. But two considerations give us pause. It is surely unfortunate when interpreters feel themselves obliged to tamper with the received text of a word which is crucial for the interpretation of the passage: this justifies the hesitation in accepting Duhm's brilliant emendation of 'Chaldeans' in Hab 1⁶, by which the prophecy was transformed into a denunciation of Alexander the Great. And, again, Dr. TORREY himself admits that 'the first principles of Hebrew metric form are not yet thoroughly understood' (p. 82). In that case we may perhaps be permitted to suspend our judgment.

Dr. TORREY, however, does not rest his case merely on the fact that the 'Cyrus-exile' element is, as he puts it, 'dabbed on' (p. 40), but on the far more important consideration that, if Cyrus be retained, the message of the prophecy seems to be involved in inextricable confusion. That message, broadly, is that God's glorious purpose of salvation for the world is to be realized through His Servant, who is primarily Israel but possibly also some great representative of Israel. It happens, however, that phrases are applied and a mission ascribed to Cyrus which are elsewhere applied and ascribed to the Servant. Are we to suppose, then, that Cyrus is the Servant? 'The confusion,' argues Professor TORREY, 'is intolerable. We are faced with an alternative. God's chosen instrument, the centre of this whole prophecy, is either Cyrus or Israel; it cannot possibly be both.' We confess we do not find this argument entirely satisfactory. Why may not Cyrus be the instrument through whom Jahweh enables Israel, through her deliverance from bondage, to win an overwhelming experience of His power and saving purpose, like that which their fathers won at the Exodus, an experience to which the prophet recurs again and again?

The thing of central importance, however, which constitutes the Second Isaiah 'a great landmark in the history of the world's religious thought' (p. 118) is his emphasis on the inclusion of the whole Gentile world, side by side with Israel, in the family of the One God. This is the 'new thing,' according to Dr. TORREY, which the prophet repeatedly professes to announce—not the historical emancipation of Israel from Babylon, but the salvation of the Gentiles through the ministration of the Servant; and this is the real consummation of the eternal purpose of God, initiated historically in the call of Abraham (41^{8f.}) and achieved through His Servant. No such magnanimous programme had ever been published before.

But who is the Servant? This is the question uppermost in the minds of all students of the Second Isaiah, and the chapter in which it is discussed is not likely to convince those who are firmly per-

suaded that the Servant in the so-called Songs, as in the prophecy proper, is to be interpreted collectively. The use of the term 'Servant,' Dr. TORREY admits, is perplexing, and the figure is not always the same; it is sometimes the personified nation, sometimes Israel's personal representative. Of the existence of a personal leader as distinguished from the group Dr. TORREY has no doubt. 'Out of this personification of the ideal Israel of the future there emerges the figure of a great leader, the Anointed One. Such a teacher and champion there must be, the future is unthinkable without him.' But if the First Isaiah in 1²⁶ could conceive the future without such an individual leader, may not also the Second? At any rate, if we put a personal interpretation on the 'Servant Songs,' it seems easier to believe that they are not from the hand that wrote the body of the prophecy, where the interpretation must be collective, than that Songs and prophecy are from the same hand and that the figure of the Servant changes.

But whatever criticisms may be made on Dr. TORREY's book in detail or as a whole, it is a splendid challenge to contemporary critical opinion. In the exegesis which follows a very careful translation, and which covers nearly half the book, he justly claims to be contributing 'much that is totally new.' There are many points both in the exegetical detail and in the broad discussion which scholars will not be slow to challenge. But they will gladly recognize that here is the work of a master who can think for himself, who has stirred fresh problems, and who has made a notable contribution to contemporary Biblical scholarship.

The story of the Unjust Steward has always been a crux in New Testament exposition. The traditional interpretation, that Jesus was commending prudence in religion, offends many people. And numerous efforts have been made to give the story another turn. The latest of these, by Mr. Frank LENWOOD, appears in the current *Congregational Quarterly*, and it is certainly original.

Mr. LENWOOD echoes most of the objections that have been made to the ordinary view. Is it probable that Jesus would have drawn a lesson of the need for holy prudence from a story in which the arresting impression is one of fraud? To which one might answer, Why not? Presumably Jesus meant to say, 'If only you would put as much thought into your religion as a business man puts into his business, even a bad business man into a bad business, you would make a greater success of it.' And why should not Jesus say that? The honesty or dishonesty is irrelevant.

Another criticism is that it is improbable in the extreme that the master who suffered from a fraud would give it praise. Again, Why not? Can we not imagine a master smiling ruefully as he considered how he had been 'done,' and saying, 'Well, he's a clever beggar; if only he had turned his talents in the right direction he would have done well for himself.' And notice, the steward is not let off. He receives his punishment. The master says, 'Well, he's smart; but he must go through with it.'

A drastic criticism is also made on the doctrine implied in the story, that the wise use of money here can make it easier for us in the hereafter. 'No use of money can give heaven. . . . Can the friends who have profited by your use of wealth open to you the hospitality of heaven? Is not that God's business? To unlock the heavenly doors you need His invitation, not merely that of the recipients of your past bounties.'

To this the answer is surely very plain. In the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which follows, the whole point is just what is objected to in our present story, that the proper use of wealth, or the abuse of it, made all the difference to the Rich Man's future. As a doctrine this may be objected to, but that it is our Lord's teaching, not only in the Unjust Steward but elsewhere, is beyond question. Why, then, cavil at it here? Jesus teaches clearly that our conduct here determines our future happiness. Witness the Parable of

the Talents and the great discourse in Mt 25, and often elsewhere.

A last criticism is concerned with the verses Lk 16^{10ff.} which are appended to the Parable. This is not really a difficulty about the Parable, because they may easily have been added by St. Luke himself. But the objection that the words about faithfulness in little and in much are irrelevant does not seem formidable. Why should not Jesus have said, 'Here was a man who was unfaithful to his trust; you at any rate are not to be like that'? The real difficulty, however, is that this is not the point of the story. The story commends prudence in religion, not faithfulness. And it is quite likely that St. Luke added the words on his own account.

Mr. LENWOOD, however, feels the difficulties mentioned almost insurmountable, and he suggests another reading. The Parable is really a criticism of Pharisaism. The Pharisees were God's stewards. Fearing a loss of power and anxious to hold their followers, they made concessions as against the strict law such as involved an immoral cheapening of God's demand. Jesus ironically praises them because at such manœuvres they are so much nimbler than the real children of God.

The Parable was not addressed to the disciples. God is the master and His demands are heavy. So heavy are they, according to the Pharisaic code, that human nature offers a passive obstruction. In face of this it was increasingly difficult for the Pharisees to hold their position. And in facing this difficulty they did what all legalists do—they made dispensations and offered accommodations in order to retain power for their system.

Jesus was aiming His criticisms at the elaborate fabric of Jewish casuistry, of which we have many examples in the Gospels. The Sabbath law and the law of Corban are good instances. The result was a moral confusion which obscured real moral values. What Jesus says therefore to the Pharisees is this: 'He was a prudent fellow, that bailiff, and so are you! We who live by the light of God cannot keep up with you there. But your

accommodations depend on a betrayal of the demand of God and are a denial of your stewardship.'

The difficulties in the way of this interpretation are very obvious. For one thing, it is too subtle. You have to strain your mind to carry it through. For another, it is quite hopeless on this view to give any reasonable interpretation of verse 9, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when it shall fail they may receive you into eternal tabernacles.' And, finally, St. Luke tells us the story was told to the disciples, not to the Pharisees.

In the analysis of the scientific and the religious attitudes contained in Mr. Carl RAHN's recent book on *Science and the Religious Life* (reviewed in another column) there is a chapter on 'The Control of Psychophysiological Processes' which may be of interest to the Christian expositor. Having indicated that control of experience and of our behaviour depends on our knowledge of the usual stimulus for a given response, and becomes still more certain when we know also the general conditions that tend to raise, or lower, the threshold for the release of the given response, he goes on to say that the records of the religious experience, especially in the later stages of culture, are found to offer, besides theologies and cosmologies, suggestions towards a technique of psycho-physiological control.

We have been so preoccupied with the theological and cosmological implications of the religious experience that we have been apt to lose sight of this material. Yet it exists in rich abundance, and constitutes a field that awaits proper scientific investigation. The insight into the principles of psycho-physiological functioning which it reveals will often be seen to anticipate our contemporary scientific accounts. Nor is it surprising that this should be so when we consider how mankind has concentrated upon the spiritual quest, and in particular upon the development of personality and character through self-discipline.

For example, the psychological bearing of the practice of fasting, so frequently recommended in ancient days, is often completely missed. The evidence shows that fasting tends to limber up the mental processes and to allay the neuromuscular tensions, and thus to create conditions which might give a chance for a new mode of psychophysiological functioning. Indeed, fasting might affect not only the individual's perception and judgment, but also his organic reactions and his overt behaviour. 'These implications of our contemporary scientific knowledge of fasting might, if we were so minded, lead us into some sort of intellectual appreciation, if not of the objective of the spiritual quest, at least of the *rationale* of one of the means that have sometimes been proposed for its attainment.'

Again, the religious traditions and records under consideration indicate much in the way of concrete knowledge of the factors that condition the affective or emotional life. Thomas à Kempis may be said to reveal a profound insight into the interrelationships of psychological and physiological processes in his instructions to the neophyte, based on the text in 1 John, 'Perfect love casteth out fear,' a text which may be regarded as offering a significant piece of knowledge of an empirical sort. For it implies not only a qualitative difference between the 'adrenalistic' state of fear and the 'anabolic' state of love, but also a functional opposition between these states. And it is only in recent years that 'the possibility of the existence of well-defined anabolic mechanisms operative in certain emotive states is being envisaged psychologically,' and much of the envisagement is as yet one-sided.

Or consider such a counsel as 'Love your enemies.' Taken in its purely outward meaning, it does not always receive the approval of common sense; and yet it builds on a firm physiological basis: the body is poisoned by hatred and its energy is wasted in anger. In thus pointing to the control of the 'catabolic' states and to the release of the 'anabolic' reaction, this counsel indicates the possibility of remaking the human individual at the physiological centre of being, namely, 'at the

point of those organic processes whose functioning determines the life of values and attitudes, of desires and purposes.'

Or consider such an instruction as 'Be still.' Just as the practice of fasting looks beyond inhibition of certain physiological processes, so this instruction looks beyond arrest of the mental life. To put to rest the questioning of the mind is no mere negative process. 'It may arise spontaneously in the individual, as in certain forms of religious awakening, or it may be inaugurated by him as part of a technique of control; but however brought about, the elimination that it involves of the state of secondary attention with its many foci and with its conflict of many impulses, apparently constitutes a condition for inducing widespread modification of mental and bodily processes.'

All this may be vaguely put and difficult to understand. But it is interesting to notice this correlation of religion and science, and that both religion and science may be regarded as pointing in the direction of the possibility of some radical psychophysiological change in our humanity.

'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' (Hos 6⁶). This short, sharp sentence is among the most significant in the Bible. In it we may find a *motto for the teaching of the Hebrew prophets in general*. Two views are held by students of the Old Testament as to the relation of the prophets to the customary worship. Some say that they condemn worship and sacrifice, and would away with all religious symbols. Others say that they condemn worship and sacrifice only if these are regarded as a substitute for practical piety. In the one case the prophets appear in the rôle of destroyers, of abolitionists; in the other case in the rôle of reformers.

Whatever the truth of the matter may be, on this we may be quite clear—that the prophets look to the moral sphere of character and conduct rather than to the ceremonial sphere for the expression of the true spirit of worship. The obedience which

God requires is not the outward obedience of ceremonial worship and piety, but rather the inward obedience of hearts and lives dedicated to His service. The sacrifices in which God is well pleased are justice and mercy and a humble walk with God.

But in the incisive utterance before us we may also find *a motto for the teaching of Hosea himself*. For the word translated 'mercy' (חֶסֶד) is Hosea's favourite word. Its primary meaning is love Divine, the love of God for His people; that is, according to Hosea, the love shown by God to Israel in the time of her espousals, when, finding her like grapes in the wilderness, like the first-fruit on a fig-tree in its first season, He chose her for Himself from among all the nations of the earth, leading her safe out of the house of captivity and bondage, and through all the wanderings of the wilderness, into the land of promise. And to Hosea's mind that primal love of God for His people was an earnest and token of God's unchanging love.

This great truth of the unchanging and unceasing love of God was borne in upon Hosea's soul—to adopt the usual interpretation of his obscure story—through a dark and bitter passage of experience. The bride of his choice, in whom he had hoped to find his dearest sanctuary on earth, proved herself unworthy and untrue. She returned at length to her lovers. But he found her again, and took her back—'a lily torn and trampled in the mire'—to his heart and home. And this experience of his, all grievous as it was, provided him with a clue to the character of eternal God. As he had loved and cherished Gomer, so the Lord had shed His exceeding great love upon the nation of His choice; and as he had sought Gomer out and redeemed her from her degradation, so the Lord still longed for His faithless people of Israel, pursuing them continually with His gracious favour.

Although Hosea's fundamental thought of God's love for His people is the primary meaning of חֶסֶד, this is obviously not expressed in the verse under consideration. But it gives fulness and richness

of content to the derivative meanings that there receive expression. There the word translated 'mercy' means love to God and love to man; and, in Hosea's conception, love to God and love to man are inspired by God's own love. When Hosea bids his countrymen offer the sacrifice of love—of love to God and man—it is unto Him who for ever seeks, unchangingly and unweariedly, to draw them to Himself with the bands of love.

We may also find in the verse before us, if not the key-note, at least *a dominant note of our Lord's teaching*. In this matter of the relation of the ceremonial and the moral His standpoint was the general standpoint of the prophets. The true worship of Him who is Spirit is worship in spirit. And in fulfilling His prophetic mission our Lord found it needful, like the prophets of old, to raise His voice against merely formal religion. Never did an Amos, an Isaiah, or a Micah lash his countrymen more mercilessly than did Jesus the Pharisees of His day, those blind guides, those whited sepulchres, that generation of vipers.

And further, while our Lord's teaching was in line with the general teaching of the prophets, it had special affinity with the teaching of Hosea. Twice it is recorded in the Gospels that our Lord bade the learned Pharisees go and learn the meaning of the Scripture, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice'; that is, according to our interpretation, 'I will have love to God and man and not,' or, 'rather than sacrifice.' And the evangelistic record of our Lord's conversation with one of the scribes is almost like an exposition of this Scripture, 'Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God, and there is none other but He; and to love Him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbour as himself is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.'

It should be easier for Christians than it was for Israel of old to obey the injunction of 'mercy,' that is, of love to God and one's neighbour. Israel had a Hosea, no doubt, to tell her of the Divine

love, and even in his life to reflect it. But Christians have One who in His own Person reflects or reveals the Divine love truly and completely. That was a great sentence of St. Augustine's—great in its simplicity: 'It was mainly for this purpose

that Christ came, to wit, that man might know how much God loves him; and that he might learn this, to the intent that he might be enkindled to the love of Him by whom he was first loved, and might also love his neighbours.'

Readers of Theological Thought.

Karl Barth.

BY PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.D., EDINBURGH.

THE present-day movement in theology which evokes the deepest interest, alike in friend and foe, is incontestably that associated with the name of Professor Karl Barth. Especially in Germany the controversy is acute.

Barth was born at Basel in 1886 as son of the theological Professor Fritz Barth, known to a former generation as author of a useful book, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, 1903. He went to school in Bern, then studied in the Universities of Bern, Berlin, Tübingen, and Marburg (he speaks of Herrmann as 'my unforgettable teacher'). In 1908-9 he acted as assistant to Dr. Rade, editor of *Die christliche Welt*; for two years thereafter he was Vicar of the German Reformed Congregation in Geneva, and from 1911 to 1921 he held the pastoral charge of Safenwil, Canton Aargau, Switzerland. In the winter of 1921 he was called to Göttingen as Professor of Reformed Theology, and since 1925 he has occupied the Chair of Theology in Münster, Westphalia. Barth is a Swiss, and the movement led by him is often described as 'the Swiss School.' Other prominent members of it are Professor Emil Brunner of Zürich, Dr. Gogarten, and Dr. Thurneysen. But in the present short article we shall limit our attention to Barth himself.

'It always embarrasses me a little,' Barth has said, 'to hear people talk so seriously of *my theology*.' It consists, he urges, simply in a point of view. He will not attempt to rival the systematic efforts of thinkers like Ritschl or Troeltsch, but will merely insert a marginal observation, propose a corrective, utter a warning cry. The line of ancestry to which he wishes to belong goes back through Kierkegaard, Luther and Calvin, Paul, Jeremiah. The name conspicuously absent here is that of Schleiermacher. To him Barth is definitely hostile, on the ground that he conceals men's sorest troubles, part of

which is their very religion, and that he confuses God and man—in theology the unpardonable sin. Man and his universe are an enigma. 'Over against him stands God, the Impossible confronting the possible, Death life, Eternity time. The solution of the enigma, the answer to the question, the end of the existential trouble is the absolutely new event that the Impossible as such becomes the possible, death becomes life, eternity time, God man.' The theme of theology is not the deification of man but the incarnation of God. We only theologize as we speak of God. Orthodoxy had its faults, but at least it never forgot this fundamental truth; it knew, at all events in principle, what is superfluous and what is vital. We have to submit our minds, as theologians, to the essential voice of the Bible, where in His Word God reveals Himself in a final authority before which we can only kneel in the dust. 'Let God be found true, but every man a liar.' We are playing with the subject unless we fix ourselves upon the scriptural view of God as Creator and Redeemer and hear in the Bible His very accents. Others abide our question, but to God we cannot say 'Why?' Every chapter in Dogmatic, like every sermon, should bear the inscription, 'God speaks,' and *what* He speaks we discover sufficiently and exclusively in the Bible. Its truth has 'the self-evidence of the Revelation which God gives synchronously to the Biblical witnesses and to His people who receive their testimony.' They receive it by the Spirit's impulse. Theology is lost when it steps outside this 'living circle of Scripture and Spirit.'

Barth perhaps gives us less help than we might desire in distinguishing what is the voice of God from what is not. He relates the alleged Divine revelation inadequately to conscience, and takes

pleasure rather in using the strongest language to affirm that man's proper attitude in listening to God's voice is prostrate and abject. But did not true prophets in the Old Testament appeal to God's righteousness in their conflict with the false? In other words, they found and they applied an ethical test. The prophet ascribed to God the highest content of his own consciousness.¹ In the parables, e.g. that of the Prodigal Son, our Lord encourages us to do the same. This defect in Barth is connected with his absolutist view of the Old Testament, which he more than tends to equate with the New. Each part of Scripture is pure and perfect Word of God. We must study it, of course, with all the instruments of scholarship; but we have misread unless we discover in it not man's thoughts about God, but God's thoughts of man. Scripture is theocentric. 'What stands in the Bible is a new world—God! God's rule! God's glory! God's incomprehensible love! Not human history, but Divine history. Not human virtues, but the virtues of Him who has called us out of darkness into His marvellous light. Not human standpoints, but the standpoint of God.' Our one duty, as we read it, is to confess that God is right and we men always in the wrong. If theology accepts its simple duty of speaking out the Word of God—impossible as that duty may be for mere men—it will never be tempted to become, as Romanticism made it, nothing better than a phenomenology of the religious consciousness.

Barth's most famous book is a commentary on Romans. It exhibits not a trace of purely historical interest or philological precision; it seeks only to pierce the historical transparency and reach what is spiritual, super-historical, transcendent, to make everything present and urgent, to hear what God is saying to men to-day out of the Epistle. Barth has no use for the specifically modern sort of exegesis which, as he holds, has turned the Bible into a collection of fascinating antiquities. Whereas what makes the Bible is its exclusive interest in God—Creator and Redeemer, Beginning and End, Origin and Goal of all things. Theology must imitate Scripture here. It too must concentrate solely upon the eternal and transcendent God dimly visible through the veil of history, and if it does so, its affinity with all philosophical thought that is conscious of its own real meaning will be seen.

¹ 'The prophetic consciousness means, in fact, that human experience is real, and that the one sure key to the knowledge of God is our knowledge of man at his highest and best' (H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, 29).

Theology of the right kind is never simple; how could it be, when it is the stammering despairing effort of temporal minds to declare the Everlasting? 'Barth,' says an admirer, 'strides along clad in a scientific terminology which is hard, intricate, and every way exacting, one which at first (and even in many points for long) leaves the impression of oracles and speaking with tongues.'

His theology has been called 'dialectic.' By this is meant that if the proper subject of theology is God's relation to man, this baffles direct and unambiguous description. We cannot apply the loved modern principle of 'continuity' and speak as if God were just the superlative of man, man and something more. Affirmations about God can only be made in contradictory and paradoxical terms, by contrasts which cancel each other yet make each of them its contribution to the expression of truth, by positives which are relieved by negatives that in turn have to yield place as the mind is thrown out at the infinite object. We need this broken, mobile, many-dimensional thinking, the name for which is 'dialectic,' if we are to bear witness to the truth. (No more than witness-bearing is permitted us; to utter the truth is for God alone.) Position and negation have perpetually to be related to each other. 'We can only speak of the glory of God in creation as we bring out the complete hiddenness of God for our eyes in Nature; of the image of God in man only as we give warning, once for all, that the man we know is fallen; of sin, only with the reminder that we should not know sin, were it not forgiven us; of the justification of the ungodly, only as we recall that it is the ungodly who is declared just.' There is a Yea in the Nay, there is also a Nay in the Yea, and each penetrates the other. The question is the answer, because the answer is the question.

In God's sight, Barth reiterates after Kierkegaard, we men are always in the wrong. Our culture and civilization, our morality, even our religion—all are wrong. This has a dazing effect, until we discover that by 'religion' Barth means what might perhaps better be called 'religiosity.' At all events, he would not deny that there may be religion of a right kind. Yet he uses the word polemically to denote man's seeking a way to God—religion as a human function, activity, accomplishment, which can be treated of psychologically or statistically. And this, he pronounces with vehemence, is simply another piece of 'the world,' imprisoned in the cosmic, never its conqueror. Mere religious consciousness will never lift men out of the realm of sin and death; it is the crown and

culmination of human experience, doubtless, but just for that reason the more questionable and unsatisfying. In this purely humane form it never has courage to face the terrifying fact of sin. Here is the tragedy of life, that man must be religious yet cannot be. All religion thus conceived can do is to force upon us a confession of the utter relativity of man before the absolute God. If theology is to recover health, it must cast loose from pre-occupation with this subjective phenomenon of piety and take its bearings anew from God, the Holy and Almighty. Only so can it return to the objectivity of the Bible and the Reformation. We have made a God after our own image, as Feuerbach told us eighty years ago; now we must again submit ourselves to the Divine righteousness and listen to the voice that speaks in conscience and from heaven.

Behind all this, again as with Kierkegaard, is a radically dualistic conception of the relation of God to man. There are two worlds or æons, one subject to 'the bondage of corruption,' one centred in the Living God. God is 'wholly other' than man the finite; the 'there' is strictly incommensurable with the 'here.' An infinite qualitative difference lies between God the Unconditioned, for whom our fittest category is the Impossible, and the old world of the contingent and the lost. No sort of continuity joins the new to the old, yet everything on this side reaches out its hands to the farther bank, drawn thither by an inscrutable transcendental relationship to the Absolute Being, that Point in another plane by which all else is equally produced and cancelled. The problematical nature of all existence is, as it were, a finger indicating the assured supramundane basis there must be; the questions we put to life are all of them questions put to us by Another. That utterly other world touches ours, the given world of sin, judgment, and death, only as tangent does circle, or, to employ another favourite symbol, as perpendicular descends upon base; and it comes as the extra-causal, extra-temporal transcendent factor which abolishes the given, that God may be all in all.

This primordial dualism is overcome in and by Christ. There is no way from man to God, not even through religion, as Barth defines it; all the more certainly is there a way from God to man. In Christ the new Reality dawns. He actualizes the impossible possibilities of which man in his religion had merely dreamed. But Barth is insistent that the Person he speaks of is not 'the Jesus of History.' Here is a point at which the paradoxical style in

which the new theology is couched becomes gravely infelicitous; for by totally rejecting 'the historical Jesus,' Barth does not at all mean that Jesus Christ never existed. On the contrary, in His Cross eternity has invaded time; the utterly strange yet absolutely gracious God has thereby, by sheer miracle, broken into fallen temporality, declaring His sovereign righteousness, disclosing the identity of His wrathful holiness and His pardoning compassion. But this Jesus is not accessible to mere historical or psychological inquiry. Study of the Synoptic Gospels is making this clearer every day. The historical (*i.e.* real) Jesus must always be contemplated in the light of His supra-historical relationship to God—which means that we must get back to a serious use of the idea of 'revelation.' Neither Christ's death nor His resurrection can be read simply in terms of history; in both God is invisibly and sovereignly active, reflecting the transcendent 'beyond' into the world of time. The Resurrection is the turning of the ages; from this point of view Barth can say it means the same as the Parousia. Christ marks the swerving of life from Nay to Yea, from judgment to grace, from death to life. 'Jesus Christ is *not* the keystone in the arch of *our* thought. He is *not* a supernatural miracle, in which we might undertake to believe. He is *not* the goal we should find awaiting us at the end of our conversion stories. He is not a figure in our history, to whom we can gain a "relationship." Least of all is He the object of religious and mystical experiences. In so far as He is all this to us, He is not Jesus Christ. He is God, who becomes man, the Creator of all things, who lies in the cradle as a child. But these words must be interpreted by those others: He is the Crucified, Dead, Buried, Descended into hell, who is risen from the dead.' The limits of human possibilities have been broken through, and the Divine possibility has become fact.

No passage in Barth's writings gives a stronger impression of his force and penetration than this on the supernatural character of the salvation made ours in Christ. 'The highest expression of the *totaliter aliter* announced in the Bible is the preaching of the forgiveness of sins. Now that we are on the point, I feel as if this word "forgiveness" compels our astonishment more than the raising of Lazarus. It is an inconceivably new factor in our practical reckoning. This new-constituting of the moral subject, right in the midst of moral and political reality, by a man's insertion in the order of the Divine Kingdom, and his being reckoned as God's; this sight of the

beginning of good in the very midst of evil ; this establishment of his royal freedom through the royal freedom of God ; this possibility of viewing alike what is nearest and what is farthest in the light of God, and of doing greatest and least to God's glory—man in his captive, limited, and provisional life yet simultaneously stayed on God quite exclusively, disturbed by God, and by God borne up—is that something we can deduce psychologically, or prove, or visualize ? Is it not something rather outside all history, a sheerly new thing, an absolute datum ?

To the *solī Deo gloria* there answers on the human side *sola fide*. Barth's first words—though not his last—on faith are deeply hostile to all psychological interpretation. It is the content that matters, not the emotional form. We must here ignore all inner processes, all subjective experience, and think rather of a transcendently Divine event that occurs in the believer. So far can Barth drive this, that he declares faith, from the psychological point of view, to be a sheer self-emptying. Faith is a vacuum, to which the Eternal gives itself as content. Without dwelling on obvious and reasonable objections to this (though it is a point at which Barth has essential mysticism, which he does not love, on his side), we may at least say that it is difficult to apprehend the notion of a faith which is the *unexperienced* attention to God's judgment and grace, and at the same time a bowing *with fear and trembling* under the condemnation and acceptance spoken in Christ. It is one thing to say that faith is spiritual and cannot be psychically localized ; it is quite another to deny it all psychical character, as though 'grace' could not be sovereignly present in mental process. There are passages in Barth which go very near suggesting that when we believe savingly, it is not we who believe at all, but Christ in us.

The Church, in Barth's view of it, is as equivocal a fact as religion itself. The institution we know belongs, like all earthly things, to the present age, the æon of flesh and sin, and is no more than a more or less perfected organization which exists to advance certain great human interests. Hence, like the world, it stands in absolute antithesis to God ; so far from being the Kingdom of God, it is the Tower of Babel. Not that the sect is worthier—on the contrary, 'Better with the Church in hell than with Pietists of higher or lower type in a heaven—which does not exist !' There is no evading the truth that the more 'efficient' and 'up to date' the Church becomes, the more it is the object of Divine judgment and rejection. If this means

that in proportion as the Church comes to be complacent, galvanized, or self-deifying, it has lost touch with the purposes for which Christ gathered round Him a fellowship of faith and love ; if it means that men as such, however much they 'get together,' cannot of themselves heal the hurt of even one soul, but that God alone can save and bless, we shall all agree, though we may ask whether, in asserting so solemn but also so patent a truth, there was need for wild and chaotic words. Even the actual Church, with all its faults, may be entitled to more credit and consideration than it receives at these hands. It was no shallow twentieth-century propagandist but John Calvin himself who spoke of it thus : 'Let us learn by the mere name of mother how profitable, indeed how necessary, is the knowledge of her ; since there is no other entrance into life unless she herself conceive us in her womb, unless she bear us, unless she foster us at her breast, unless she guard us under her care and government, until we put off this mortal flesh, and become like the angels.' Barth cannot escape from this difficulty by pointing to the perfectly familiar distinction between the visible and the invisible Church. If the Church, as Barth himself proceeds to urge, is the *communio sanctorum*, the home of penitence, we may well ask whether this *communio* has not always taken social forms and does not, as a fact, confront us either in the actual Church as we know it, or nowhere at all. There is surely some middle path between putting the actual Church in place of God and denying it every kind of spiritual value. May we not all unite in saying that the Church, like the family, is God's potential instrument for the sovereign ends of grace ?

No Barthian, I imagine, will ever admit that his views can be stated by an outsider without caricature, but it is to be hoped that in the foregoing account some approach to justice has been made. Barth is not simple ; but he inquires pointedly whether life is simple, and whether it was to be anticipated that we men should succeed in affirming the final truths of God otherwise than in the language of explosive paradox. He rightly rejects the plea that Christian men would do better to keep to practical religious tasks and leave theology alone. If you have to *preach*, must you not clarify your thought of what you stand for, against Rome, against secularism, against all theology that centres in man or the Ego ? And the best starting-point is that of universal doubt concerning all previous systems. 'He who wishes to be sure, must first have become absolutely unsure.'

In reading Barth we ought constantly to say to ourselves—*respice finem*. Take his first iconoclastic utterances with a pinch of salt; wait till he has concluded his argument before you pronounce a verdict. He may begin with shattering negatives, but it is ten to one he *knows* they are exaggerations and has indulged in them in order to rouse the complacent and shake them into real thinking. This dialectic procedure is not so far convincing as a natural mode of reaching the ultimate implications of the Christian gospel, and may only result in putting a differently constructed logic in place of the Hegelian; but it has an interest and austerity of its own. The theology of Barth, whatever else, is the theology of a great, a volcanic, soul, that has trembled at the Word of God. With a passionate and prophetic intensity, he is seeking to draw the Christian mind of his generation back to the vast truth that in the Bible, interpreted by the Spirit, God has spoken to the world, and spoken once for all. There is an objective revelation, which is as much above our jurisdiction as the stars in the sky. We must question all human formations, whether inward or outward; we must put them at

the bar, under the judgment of the Lord of heaven and earth. This is, above all, true of theologies—and Barth, as he tells us explicitly, would not exempt his own. In theology we must think our very best—that is our duty. But we must never forget how the end of all theologies is that every mouth is stopped before God.

Barth is important and memorable, if not for his solutions, at least for the cardinal questions he compels us to encounter. And he does compel us. He thrusts upon us those terrible live problems that are rampant in the world. So far he seems to have spoken at least as much from the standpoint of the 'anxious inquirer' as from that of the full and characteristic Christian faith which animates Ro 8. Over much of his writing we might place the motto: 'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' Only in the closing chapter, as it were, does he turn to expound that deeper word: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' But this distribution of accent may yet change, and if it changes, Barth will prove an even greater and more revolutionary Christian force than at this hour.

Literature.

THE FAITH THAT REBELS.

It is not so long ago that the late Sir Henry Jones expounded his philosophical creed under the phrase, 'A Faith that Enquires.' The title of Principal D. S. Cairns's new book appears to have been modelled on that phrase. But it is a very different type of exposition that is here offered. *The Faith that Rebels* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net) is the faith of Jesus Himself. It is true, says Dr. Cairns, that Jesus lived and worked in the spirit of the prayer, 'Thy will be done,' but His attitude to the world's evil was not one of acquiescence but of opposition, and in this He was conscious of aligning Himself with the Divine will. And, further, by the exercise of a rebellious, as distinguished from an acquiescent, faith—as in His miracles—He claimed to have power given Him from on high to overcome pain, disease, and death.

It is, in the main, a re-examination of the miracles of Jesus that Dr. Cairns offers in this volume. The point he would emphasize is that these are represented in the Gospels as Divine answers to

the prayers of a faith that rebelled against evil as being alien to the Kingdom of God; and it is suggested that inasmuch as Jesus wrought miracles by His human faith in God, and not in virtue of His possession of metaphysical Deity, the power of working miracles passed from Him to those who in the early days caught the secret of His faith, and there is no insuperable reason why such power should not be exercised in our modern world.

This way of approach to the miracles of Jesus is not the way of the older Christian apologetic. The miracles are not to be regarded as mere adjuncts to the Christian revelation, as being 'evidences' of its truth; they are affirmed to be integral parts of it. But while many would endorse Dr. Cairns's criticisms of the 'traditional' or evidential theory of miracle, and admit the force also of his criticisms of the 'modernist' view (which rejects miracle in the name of science and the 'closed system' of Nature), they would hesitate to accept the view of miracle here expounded and defended. Apart altogether from

a priori difficulties in regard to the conception of miracle, they would still be inclined to accentuate the distinction between healing miracles and 'Nature' miracles, and even in the case of the recorded miracles of healing, they would ask every time, Is the record trustworthy? Indeed we must say, in view of the critical discussions of the miracles of Jesus that have been maintained during the last hundred years or so, it is a defect of Dr. Cairns's work that it virtually assumes without discussion the genuine or authentic quality of the evangelistic records, apparently in their entirety.

While the main object of the book is to call attention to the 'steady reiteration' in the Synoptic narratives of the vital relation between the miracles and faith, there is much else in it of interest and value. For Dr. Cairns seeks to set his views on miracle in the context of modern thought. One of his best chapters is on 'Nature and Morality.' It is affirmed that Nature, so far from being indifferent to moral and spiritual ends, is plastic in the Divine hands for the discipline of the human spirit. Here, as elsewhere throughout the volume, and not least in the eloquent concluding chapter on the problem of evil, the style is frank, sincere, and expressive, and the author is seen to combine broadmindedness and a sympathetic tolerance with an evangelical and theistic conservatism.

A BASIS FOR THEOLOGY.

In *Philosophical Theology*, i. (Cambridge University Press; 21s.), a bulky volume of four hundred and twenty pages, the Rev. F. R. Tennant, D.D., B.Sc., aims at supplying the student of theology with the philosophical information and orientation necessary before embarking on the special province of theology proper.

The peculiar danger of writing on philosophy *ad hoc* is that philosophical science should be coloured by an apologetic bias. We naturally distrust anyone who writes on any science with an interest in his mind beyond the interest of the science itself. It can at once be said that the student can take the vast amount of information gathered here with absolute confidence in its trustworthiness, up-to-dateness, and relevancy. Even technical students of philosophy will find here focussed an amount of knowledge which they can only find otherwise with difficulty scattered through many volumes. The theological student can accept this philosophical propædæutic to his own study without the slightest fear of having

palmed off on him a peculiar brand of philosophy to suit the specific theological palate.

The wealth of material collected in this volume and genetically displayed is amazing, and even a bare enumeration of the topics is impressive—Consciousness, the senses and the intellect, perception, etc., self and soul, personality, Valuation—Rationalism, Empiricism, Idealism—Probability, Nature and Limits of Scientific Knowledge, Religious Experience. Besides these there are eleven appendices where important topics are more fully discussed.

It will thus be seen that the volume is more philosophical than theological, and one may doubt the relevancy of the title, but we imagine that in the second volume which is to follow the justification for the title will be substantiated. Even here we have interesting and important theological discussions, for example, 'faith,' where 'faith' in the religious sense is co-ordinated with 'faith' in science; and important distinctions valid in psychology, like that between 'psychic immediacy' and 'psychological immediacy' (p. 46), are used as a criterion to evaluate the worth of such realms as mysticism and the idea of the numinous, so well-known since Otto called attention to it. Whether one agrees or not with Dr. Tennant in the large use he makes of this latter distinction, no one can doubt the fairness and the worth of his method and matter. It may be that there is a tendency to make perceptual knowledge the norm of all knowledge, but, be that as it may, we have here a weighty treatment of those philosophical disciplines which the theologian must know and must decide on before he can with confidence enter on his own domain. Students of theology—even those whose university training has made them cognizant of the sciences of psychology, logic, metaphysics, and ethics, as well as those who have not had this training—will heartily thank Dr. Tennant for the help and information they are given in this book. We imagine also that those whose duty it is to teach theology will be foremost in praising him for a book which they can heartily recommend to their students.

CHRIST AND SOCIETY.

The Trustees of the Halley Stewart Lectureship have been fortunate in their choice of the first two lecturers on the trust. The first was Sir Oliver Lodge, whose 'Science and Human Progress' was a fascinating volume. It has been followed by a volume from Dr. Gore—*Christ and Society*

(Allen & Unwin ; 4s. 6d. net). Dr. Gore has been known not only for his High Church views and his able essays in apologetic, but also for his advanced opinions on the relation of Christianity to social politics. We have had more than one essay on this subject from his fertile pen, and the present volume may be regarded as a summary statement of views which he has long held and promulgated.

These views may be briefly indicated in a series of four propositions. First, the present condition of society, though not entirely discouraging, is yet such as to inspire a deep sense of dissatisfaction and alarm and a demand for thorough reformation. Second, the evils we deplore are due to human selfishness and avarice, and therefore their reformation demands more than anything else a change of spirit. Third, we must look for this altered attitude to life not to the conversion of masses but to groups of men inspired by prophetic leadership and ready for suffering and sacrifice in this cause. And, finally, Jesus Christ is the Saviour of men, not only individually but socially and in this present life, and those who believe in Him should band themselves together to further the principles which He taught.

In order to commend these statements Dr. Gore begins with the social teaching of Jesus, because one cause of our present weakness in the face of social evils is our uncertainty as to what Jesus taught about the subject. From this Dr. Gore proceeds to outline the historical attempts which have been made to embody Christ's idea of the Kingdom of God in the Apostolic Church, in the mediæval period, and under the influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation with their issue in the Industrial Revolution. Finally, the lectures return upon the main propositions, and, on the basis of his exposition of the gospel teaching and his historical review, Dr. Gore gathers up the lessons to be learned for our own day. Our task is to gird ourselves to the duty of letting the world know what the Church of Christ really stands for, what its real mind is about the foundations of society, about the relation of man to man and class to class and nation to nation.

Dr. Gore is not content with generalities. His cure for the distresses of the present is definite. We need to let the world see clearly, first of all, that Christianity is a life, and a life of fellowship with the community, not the individual first. One of our pressing necessities is a radical work on Christian ethics in order to enlighten men as to the real responsibilities of communal life. Further,

we must form associations for Christian social propaganda, a series of Copecks which will be inter-denominational. The purpose of those associations would be to reassert the social meaning of Christianity, and to proclaim the necessity of social and political changes which would leave the way to a full life free to all.

Such in brief is a summary of this suggestive volume. It has all Dr. Gore's clarity of thought, his persuasiveness, and his fairness. There are not a few points at which any of us might like to cross swords with the writer. But these are matters of detail for the most part. And on a general view of the lectures we can only say that on the whole the survey seems to us to be sound. Dr. Gore's fundamental propositions are beyond dispute, and it is to be hoped that in the wide audience that is sure to listen to him their earnest advocacy will bear the kind of fruit that he himself desires to see.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Science and the Religious Life (Milford ; 13s. 6d. net), issued by the Yale University Press under the name of Mr. Carl Rahin, is an able and remarkably suggestive essay, showing wide culture and broad sympathies as well as freshness of outlook. But it is not always easy to catch its meaning and drift, and it presupposes a certain acquaintance with the technical terms of psychological and physiological analysis.

Obviously the author is deeply interested in the phenomena of religion, and in this essay he approaches religion from the psycho-physiological standpoint, viewing it as a matter of human experience and behaviour. Though he eschews metaphysical considerations, he finds room—significantly enough—from the scientific standpoint of organic evolution for the knowledge 'of which Plato speaks, that was sought by Plotinus and the neo-Platonists and by the Christian saints in the centuries after them.'

It is the starting-point of the book that on the hypothesis of organic evolution, used not merely as an explanatory principle but as a principle of quest, we may look for a changed or transfigured humanity. And it is the main contention of the book that, if we are to apprehend the nature of such a possible change, we should enter upon a psycho-physiological study of the fundamental attitudes of science and of the religious life. 'For it is at these points that human experience and behaviour bear the marks of organic adjustment.' Accordingly, the task which the author sets before

him is the aforesaid psycho-physiological study. He would analyse 'the psychological patterns of the scientific and the religious attitudes,' as also 'the physiological processes involved in the technique of the scientific and the religious life.'

Readers of this magazine would turn more readily to the second part of the work, where the religious life is considered in its physiological significance, in its emotional, attentional, and cognitive aspects, and from the standpoint of the psychology of volition and control. A point which the author makes apropos of the last-named standpoint is that the records of the religious experience often present to us elaborations of a technique of control indicating a surprising insight into the nature of the psycho-physiological processes. But of this we take note in another column.

NEO-HEGELIANISM.

A somewhat massive volume comes to hand entitled *Neo-Hegelianism*, by Professor Hiralal Haldar, Ph.D. (Heath Cranton; 25s. net). It is described as 'A Study rather than a History of British Neo-Hegelianism.' Writing on Neo-Hegelianism in Hastings' 'Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics,' Professor J. W. Scott remarked, 'Until some adequate history of the movement appears, the only way to get a grasp of what it had to teach is to read a few works of typical representatives of it.' This suggestion fell like a seed into the fertile soil of Professor Haldar's mind, and the present book is the result. The writer, it may not be unnecessary to explain, is Professor of Philosophy in the University of Calcutta, and he acknowledges that 'the study and interpretation of Hegel and the philosophical movement which has arisen from his influence has been the chief occupation of my life.' 'The only way,' he declares, 'to compel this dark philosopher to surrender his meaning is laboriously and patiently to keep pace with him, with bad falls occasionally, no doubt, as he explains the movement of the categories from Pure Being to the Absolute Idea. You must *think* with him, watch his thought, so to speak, in the making. One must understand the whole of Hegel or nothing of him—a hard task undoubtedly, but there is no way to avoid it. There is no royal road to the citadel of the Absolute Idea.' Professor Haldar has shirked no toil, and of his competence to speak as an authoritative interpreter of Hegel there can be no doubt. In the present volume he covers an immense amount

of ground. Beginning, of course, with Hutchison Stirling and his epoch-making 'Secret of Hegel,' he goes on to expound the teaching of T. H. Green and the Cairds, to which he gives about a third of his book. Then follow chapters on W. Wallace, D. G. Ritchie, Bradley, Bosanquet, John Watson, Sir Henry Jones, Professors Muirhead and Mackenzie, Lord Haldane, and Dr. J. E. M'Taggart. All these are familiar names in the history of nineteenth-century British philosophy, and their views individually have been frequently expounded and criticised. But their association together in one volume and the sustained criticism of their views by one powerful thinker give a valuable conspectus of the philosophic system to which they all, more or less, owned allegiance. Professor Haldar is to be congratulated on a really fine piece of work. As his career as a teacher of philosophy draws to a close he has laid a noble tribute at the feet of his masters in the realm of thought.

John Bunyan, by the Rev. W. Charter Piggott (Congregational Union of England and Wales; 1s.), is a short but very readable account of the life and writings of the great Puritan dreamer. It is well that interest in Bunyan should by every means be stimulated in this the tercentenary year of his birth, and Mr. Piggott has contributed an account of him in a handy form such as will suit many readers.

Back to Realities, by Sydney Herbert Mellone, M.A., D.Sc. (Constable; 2s. net), is an attempt to find 'a way out of the present chaos in religion.' After briefly sketching the confusions which have arisen in connexion with the sacramentarian controversy and the discussions about evolution, Dr. Mellone goes on to suggest that there are only two logical positions possible, namely, Romanism, the religion of authority, and Unitarianism, the religion of reason. The various forms of Protestantism he dismisses rather summarily, but ends with the suggestion that we are all Unitarians without knowing it.

The Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D., holds a unique place among the Wesleyans as a pioneer in every form of religious and social service. His *Reminiscences* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net) are altogether too meagre to give any adequate conception of his life-work, but such as they are they will be prized. Apart from the personal record

they have an independent historical value as throwing light on the stormy period connected with the English education controversy and the work of the London County Council with which Dr. Scott Lidgett was so prominently associated.

The controversy between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism is always with us. It has been brought sharply to our minds in the recent Prayer Book discussions; and it is well that we should have before us in convenient form the late Dr. R. W. Dale's well-known Exeter Hall Lecture (1874) on *Protestantism*. The lecture has been republished at 1s. by the Independent Press. It finds the ultimate principle of Protestantism to be the direct access of the soul to God, the direct access of God to the soul. This principle assumes one form 'in our vindication of the Right of Private Judgment, another in our contention for the authority of Holy Scripture, and another in the doctrine of Justification by Faith.' We have had pleasure in reading again the pages of so eloquent and fair-minded a controversialist.

It is always interesting and profitable to listen to the reflections on life and doctrine of one who 'has seen many days' and yet remains optimistic and fresh of mind. And therefore we welcome *Ways towards the Spiritual Life*, by Professor G. Dawes Hicks (Lindsey Press; 5s. 6d. net). The title suggests a devotional manual, but the book in reality is quite different. Dr. Hicks has for a quarter of a century presided at the closing gathering of each session in the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, and delivered an address to the outgoing students. This volume contains a selection of these. There is in these addresses a ripe wisdom, a level common sense, and a broad outlook which make it a pleasure to read them as it must have been to listen to them. Among the subjects are The Vocation of the Scholar, The Church and Human Life, The Religion of the New Democracy, Modernism in Theology, The Uprising of Youth, and Sincerity in Religion. Those who know where Dr. Hicks stands will know also what to expect in the way of theological standpoint. But whatever standpoint we hold we shall receive stimulus and inspiration from these admirable addresses.

A curious book has been compiled by the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A., which he calls *Futile Sermons* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). The Archbishop of Canterbury made a statement at the Church Congress in 1925 about the preaching in the Church

of England. It was an unfavourable statement, dwelling on the poverty of the average sermon, and its reasons and possible cures. The subject was taken up by all the newspapers in the kingdom, and Mr. Drawbridge gathers into a series of chapters the comments of different papers on the subject. The chapter headings follow the line of the Primate's remarks, and are something like this: Is the Average Sermon Bad? Are Bad Sermons the Chief Cause of Empty Churches? Midnight Oil, What are Adequate Sermons? Repeating Platitudes instead of Facing Problems, The Poverty of the Clergy, The Congregation to Blame. And so on. Interspersed are comments by the author. Such a book may possibly do preachers in training or preachers in practice some good if only by the promotion in them of a humble spirit. For others it will be dull reading perhaps. Yet you never know.

A little book of a useful kind that has stood the test of trial is *How to Make Your Meditation*, by the Rev. H. Congreve Horne (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net). We all think and we think most of the time. The problem here dealt with is how to make our thinking effective for life. Simple directions are given both for Bible-reading and for prayer, and a method is suggested by which we may conduct a 'meditation' in a practical and fruitful fashion. The little book is written quite simply and in a beautiful spirit and is bound to be helpful.

John Bunyan, The Man and His Work, by the Venerable A. R. Buckland, M.A. (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net), is 'not offered as a new life of Bunyan, nor as a critical study of his publications. It is rather a book about the man and his work addressed to the general reader, with the simple aim of meeting the needs of those who wish to know something of Bunyan, his times, his career, his published works, their character and their influence.' Though thus modestly introduced, it is a piece of solid workmanship, and may be warmly commended. The writer has acquainted himself with the chief authorities and writes with lucidity and an easy mastery of the facts.

The Rev. Francis Bartlett Proctor, M.A., F.K.C.L., who describes himself as 'an octogenarian preacher,' has collected together twenty-three discourses in a volume curiously entitled, *Orthodox Prophesying Deceits* (Elliot Stock; 6s. net). Apparently he is of opinion that our popular preaching is at once orthodox and merely rhetorical, and that it

may be described as 'telling lies about God,' presumably in ignorance. He regards himself as 'advanced,' as believing that the Creeds need revision in the light of modern knowledge; but in some respects he is far from being so, as witness the following remark concerning John the beloved disciple: 'We make the bold and adventurous suggestion that, as there is no authentic record of his death, it is possible he did not die at all.' The style of the volume tends to be as disjointed as its title.

Close Quarters, by Mr. R. D. Rees, M.A. (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is a live book. The writer is a missionary in China who, when at home on furlough, has taken part in various conferences and campaigns at which he has endeavoured to envisage the world situation as a whole, and to base upon it a call to Christian service. The substance of these addresses makes a book well worth reading, full of sanity and strong Christian thinking, combined with that wide outlook and freedom from national and racial

prejudice which we associate with the best of our missionaries.

Your Bible, by the Rev. J. Arnold Quail, M.A., B.D. (Teachers & Taught; 1s. 6d. net), is a remarkable little book. Its design is to give an account of the ancestry and origin of the English Bible in terms suitable to the capacity of youthful readers. The writer has achieved a real success. Step by step he leads backward through versions and manuscripts to the original books and to the life behind the books. It is a fascinating sketch of the agelong drama of revelation.

The Grounds of the Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus, by the Rev. R. Macgregor (Wardman, Letchworth; 6d.), is a brief tract dealing with the various theories which have been put forward, and arguing that the disciples saw the Risen Christ 'in the sense that they had Divine authority for the conviction that He was risen.' It is thoughtful, but all too slight for so great a theme.

The Sermon on the Mount.

Prayer (Mt. vii. 7-12).

BY THE REVEREND CANON A. W. F. BLUNT, M.A., B.D., DERBY.

I.

IN the realm of prayer our Lord walks as assured Master of its roads, its laws, and its life. Other men have 'been there,' some of them 'far ben' in it, and speak of what they have learnt on their visits. He lived there. The prayer-country was His native air. The occasions on which He is recorded to have prayed are only points that men marked in a line which was always continuous. We are told of times when He prayed with vehemence, or continued long in prayer. We treasure words of prayer which He used on this or on that occasion. But our knowledge of the nature of His prayer-activity rests on evidence that goes deeper than these instances; it rests on the deep foundation of our belief as to who He was. 'The Son of Man, which is in heaven,' so the Fourth Gospel defines Him (Jn 3¹³). In heaven, even when on earth; His living reveals the heavenly life as it may be lived under earthly conditions. He never left

heaven, for His mind always moved 'in the heavenly places.' Of Him it was fact which of us is too often but aspiration or ideal, that 'our citizenship is in heaven.' And the very life-breath of the heavenly life is that intercourse with God which men call 'prayer.'

Our Lord, then, prayed because He could not do otherwise. Human as He willed to become, He doubtless needed prayer, as we all need it, to fortify Him against His daily 'temptations' and to give Him grace for His daily service. But these necessities only set the form in which at times His prayers shaped themselves. Apart from these temptations and these needs, He prayed for the ultimate reason which justifies all prayer—because prayer is the natural exercise of the human spirit. It is, in the truest truth of things, as natural for man's soul to desire to pray as it is natural for man's lungs to desire to breathe. We pray by a native prompting, and only secondarily, because man is frail and the world is evil, by an induced

habit. For we must realize that it is native to man to desire health. This is seen to hold good beyond question in the physical or the mental sphere. The body craves for healthy air and exercise and food ; sickness is the protest that nature makes if the body is denied her proper regimen. The mind is built to desire knowledge ; ignorance or stupidity or superstition is nature's protest against the starvation or the malnutrition of the intellectual faculties. By parity of reasoning, sin may be regarded as nature's protest against the denial to the soul of that diet of grace which it needs in order to grow healthily. Man's soul, unperverted, craves for that which is good. Its natural food is the good gifts which, however mediated to us, come from God. Prayer is the conscious effort to resort to God for His good things—the things which man, the child of God, spontaneously craves for and alone finds really satisfying.

In a sense, of course, God's love and grace are all around and about us, whether we recognize it or not. 'In him we live, and move, and have our being.' God encompasses us. His love is the air of the spiritual world. But we may, if we choose, refuse to breathe it in. In that world evil influences are also at work, and to them we may, if we will, have recourse, so perverting our true nature and seeking to delight ourselves in that which will not feed or enrich our souls, though for the time we think it sweet. The deliberate exercise of prayer is needed if we are to learn to recognize and appreciate and take delight in that which God offers. In every sphere of life man has to be taught to know and seek that which alone is good for him ; and in each sphere man is often woefully stubborn to go his own self-willed way and to spend money for that which is not bread, and labour for that which satisfieth not.

II.

We do not, then, reach to the inmost truth about the necessity of prayer, when we think of it only as a shield against the fiery darts of the wicked, or only as a weapon for the casting down of strongholds. Of course it is those, but it is those only incidentally to the fact that, in a world where evil is strong, man has enemies who seek to prevent him from attaining the full human stature. In its inmost essence prayer is the search for the necessary diet of the human soul. Man is built to achieve spiritual greatness, and prayer is a necessity for spiritual achievement.

It is, then, the highest employment of man's self-

determining activity. 'Ask, and it shall be given you ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened unto you' (77). We may please ourselves by detecting a delicate discrimination between these three forms of conative activity. We seek for that which we have not, and do not yet know where to find. We knock at the door of a house which we believe ourselves desirous to enter, but have not yet entered. We ask for that which we have not, but know where to find. But this discrimination is perhaps more subtle than we need to make it. For all three—asking, seeking, and knocking—are in different similes but expressions of one human activity, the activity of desire. The law which our Lord here declares may be first, most generally, and most simply formulated thus : 'Sow a desire and reap an achievement.'

The universe is so framed as to be responsive to human desire. Therein, as is well known, is one great argument for the belief in immortality ; the desires of the human heart are prophecies of their fruition. Man, as a free creative being, is entrusted with a power to wring from the universe by the force of his desiring that on which he sets his affection. It is perhaps the supreme testimony of the trust that God reposes in man that He has made us such as can bend events to our will. Our responsibility for the character of our desires is, then, a very serious one. For even wrong desires and low ambitions have their effective power. Our Lord indicated this possibility clearly enough. They who make their prayers or do their alms to be seen of men have, He said, 'their reward.' The law of the power of human desire is not annulled when the reward desired is not worth having or not finally satisfactory. To some men, we hear, God 'gave their desire and sent leanness withal into their souls.' They desired, and therefore achieved. The achievement left them lean ; but the desire did not fail to achieve its end. 'We are such stuff as dreams are made of' is true in another sense than Shakespeare intended. For it is the yearnings of our souls, good or evil, high or low, that make us what we are. A noble desire makes a noble man, and a mean desire makes a mean man.

Hence, if to sow a desire is to reap an achievement, nothing can be more important than to sow the right sort of desires. No aspiration can be more fundamentally right than to have 'an understanding heart,' understanding to know what is good, and the heart engaged to love it. 'That we may love the thing which thou commandest, and desire that which thou dost promise,' what else is that but the gift of Faith ? 'Faith is the

substance of things hoped for,' it is that which convinces us of the 'is-ness' of ideals. To think on the things which are pure and noble and of good report, to think on and desire them, that, it may be said, is a matter of spiritual 'taste,' and tastes proverbially differ. But here interposes the truth which is the deepest truth about man, that he is made in the image of God; that therefore to love the highest and desire the noblest is man's native bent. Man's soul craves for health, and in God alone finds it. 'My soul is athirst for God.' This is not true only of an occasional individual's temperament. It is the *vérité vraie* about the nature of man. 'In God's will alone is our peace.' 'Thou, O Lord, hast made us for thyself, and our heart knows no rest until it rests in thee.' Man is made such that he can find no final satisfaction save in God. We may, we do, debase our high estate, deface God's image in us, seek satisfaction in vanity. But that chase is feverish and pathological. In each of us is a Divine something which witnesses whose children we really are; and that element we can atrophy, we can frightfully distort, but it is very hard to kill it entirely. It keeps on reviving, for it is part of our veriest nature. *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret* ('Expel nature with a pitchfork, and she will yet return'). That line, no doubt, was written with a cynical suggestion; but we who have learnt in Jesus Christ what man really is, we to whom the Incarnation has taught that, to use Bishop Gore's striking phrase, 'so truly was man made in God's image that God could really live a human life without ceasing to be God,' we know what is the ineradicable element in human nature. Many men have gone far in the eradicating of the evil in them; but has any man ever yet quite succeeded in eradicating the good in himself?

III.

We have no need to search for a statement of what man's highest desires can be. The Lord's Prayer (6⁹⁻¹³) provides us with the perfect summary of these. Let us note, firstly, the order in which desires are to be graded. First we are to wish God's wishes. 'Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done.' And, if God is indeed 'our Father,' what else is it possible, is it even rational, to put first except what He wishes? Of course nothing in the universe can be better for man than His will. 'Thy will be done.' We say it in a minor key in the time of our tribulation. Well if we can do that at least without whining

an acquiescence which is but the expression of a peevish resentment; better if we can rise even then to a major key of joyful acceptance. But if that is a heroism of faith beyond our compass, at any rate let us teach ourselves in the days of our wealth to believe that nothing better for man can happen than that God's will should be done. For God's will is the only hope of man's happiness.

After, but only after, we have learnt to wish God's wishes may we safely be allowed to wish for ourselves; for then we shall only wish for ourselves those things which we need in order to serve Him. Forgiveness and guidance—the fundamental necessities for health of spirit; and provision—the elementary necessity for the health of the spirit's material organ: these are the sum total of what we have need of. And even these we are to desire for the common behoof; even in praying for myself I am not to isolate my own need from the common good which includes mine. 'Give us, forgive us, deliver us.' The Lord's Prayer is the prayer of the family circle. The Father sets the direction of the family activity. Each of His children, utterly dependent as he is on the Father's grace and care, is called to offer his co-operative effort to the realization of the Father's will for the enrichment of the whole family life. Herein, then, is comprehended all that a Christian need desire. All Christian prayers that have ever been uttered can only be commentaries on, or inferences from, or elaborations of, one or other of these pregnant clauses.

As the Lord's Prayer is the summary of Christian desire, so it is the model for the Christian expression of desire. We should realize this more firmly than we do. We say the prayer too glibly; perhaps we say it too often. The very brevity of the phrases should be to us an advice of their real character. They are surely the final acts of a spiritual struggle of meditation on the Will of God and on our duty in regard to it. A whole lifetime of growth in the understanding and love of God's will is not too long to teach us how to say the Lord's Prayer really well. The utterances are the outburst from a soul that has made a sustained effort to consecrate its desires to God. Indeed, on one very sacred occasion, in our Lord's Agony in Gethsemane, we are allowed to see in part the spiritual process actually at work in Him. 'If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.' 'If this cannot pass away, except I drink it, thy will be done.' There is, may we not say, a clear progress of self-dedication here? In that mysterious struggle of will against feeling

He moves from 'I would' through 'Thou wiltest not' to 'Thy will be done,' and 'I come to do thy will, O God.'

If, then, prayer is such a process as this, what need can there be for 'much speaking' or 'vain repetitions' (67)? The real battle of the spirit takes place in the silence. The words only register the victory. When the word comes, the struggle is over.

If we talk too much in our prayers—and do we not?—may it not be because we talk too easily? There is, it may be, a fatal fluency in praying, as in preaching. If we gave ourselves more vehemently to the struggle to reach and make our own God's point of view, our words of prayer would assuredly be fewer; but their power would be more convincing. Our praying is too often only from the teeth outwards; it is not the explosion of a spirit which has agonized to know what God means, to accept what God wills, and to love what God commands. We mean well, but we do not mean hard enough, nor from a deep enough depth within us. Our souls do not sweat in their praying, as our Lord's did in His. And so our spiritual progress lags. *Tantum proficies quantum tibi vim adhibueris* ('Thy profiting shall be according to the measure of the violence thou dost to thyself'). Is this perhaps what our Lord meant when He spoke of the violent men who take the Kingdom of Heaven by force?

IV.

We recur to our first formulation of our Lord's law of prayer: 'Sow a desire and reap an achievement.' The phrase has an Emersonian sound. It is none the worse for that. Emersonianism is no bad starting-point from which to set out on the path of reflection about Christian truth. But we have travelled a long way since then; and, as we now revise that formula, does it not seem to us to have a tangle of a certain self-sufficiency, which is perhaps also Emersonian, which is certainly not purely Christian? An 'achievement,' we said; but 'what hast thou that thou didst not receive? But if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?' Moreover, achievement perhaps implies the manipulation of circumstances; at least it seems to speak of a battle against resistance. Well, even that last is not an unauthorized picture of the process of prayer, if we call to mind Jacob's wrestling with the angel or our Lord's exhortations to importunity. God, it may be, loves to test the metal of our desire.

Yet, if He does so, it is only in love. The

Christian revelation speaks its most glorious truth when it bids us see the universe as the sphere for the operation of a love which is through and through personal. When we realize this, 'achievement' seems a poor, cold, impersonal word for a relation in which our Father and we are jointly engaged. 'Ask, and ye shall receive.' No, 'Sow a desire and reap an achievement' does not do justice to the magnificent anthropomorphism of that sentence. Shall we, then, rephrase our formula? 'Sow a desire and reap a grace'—that is better. If there is one certainty that our Lord seems to affirm most confidently in this passage, it is that the Divine Father responds to the desire of His children. Yet even this way of putting the relation does not touch the deepest of its gracious mystery. What does our Lord mean when He reminds us that 'your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him,' if not that God's grace is not simply responsive to man's desire, but is previous to it? 'Before ye ask him,' our Father's love is welling out from Him to usward. It is the eternal *præ* of anything that we can desire, let alone express. He knows our necessities before we ask. He wills our good before we ourselves desire it.

Theological students will recognize herein the truth for the due acknowledgment of which Augustine battled so fiercely, so remorselessly, against Pelagius. We may well be grateful that he did so. For indeed that conviction of the eternal priority of God's movement to any motion of man is ultimately the only reason why we dare to pray at all. We dare, ignorant as we are and know ourselves to be, to interpose our desires into the course of this world of God's, because we are sure that His loving wisdom holds on its course, unclouded in its vision and unshaken in its purpose by any errors that we may commit in directing our desires to this or that object; and that, though our wishing may be as foolish as it is eager, yet, if only our heart be right with Him, He can see beneath our foolishness to our sincerity and can use the force of that for His ends of good. More, we are sure that His love is at work before we ask. Our Father, who knows what things we have need of before we ask, does not require to be stimulated to desire our satisfaction. 'Before they call, I will answer.' God's love is active before it is invoked. Our wills are ours; but before we knew that we had a will, He had been working on us to persuade us to make our wills His; and the highest we can achieve is to give in to His persuasion. If we at all desire what is good, it is because He has moved us to it. So far as there is 'response' in

the relation between Him and us, it is from us that it must first come. For His love ever and always moves first.

We commonly speak of prayer and grace as a relation of reciprocity; and there is certainly a truth in such a presentation, for our Lord Himself uses it. 'Seek, and ye shall find; ask, and ye shall receive.' It is the gracious aspect of the universal law of retribution. 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again' is a word that contains an obvious threat or warning; but it also has its promise. 'Desire of me, and I will give thee'; in aspiration and its satisfaction too, as well as in sin and judgment, action and reaction play their parts. This is why St. Matthew places the golden rule which is for human relations side by side with the teaching on the Father's readiness to answer prayer (7¹²). All that we do to men, we do to God; and God sees to the requiting of it. The same idea is contained in our Lord's assertion of the reciprocity of forgiveness. 'If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you' (6^{12, 14, 15}). Right in the centre of all our human relationships our Father holds His place, and works His work. If we forgive our brother, our brother's response may come or may tarry, but the requital of our Father's forgiveness is immediate and certain. For our act of forgiveness is the effective act of our desire for goodwill among men, and that desire God meets with His goodwill towards us.

We reach, nevertheless, a deeper truth about God's dealings with us when we pass beyond the conception of reciprocity and learn to think of prayer and grace as a relation of co-operation between God and man. The desire that is finally effectual is that which God and man desire together; in St. James' phrase, 'the fervent prayer of a righteous man,' of a man, that is to say, whose will is given to God; in short, the prayer which God's Spirit utters within us. As forgiveness of neighbour is essentially a plea for human co-operation to restore a broken harmony, so prayer is essentially a co-operation with God to set forward His kingdom; and such co-operation cannot be ineffectual, for there is God Almighty in it.

What, then, of the puzzle of what men call 'unanswered prayer'? One may protest in passing that there is no such thing; 'ungranted' prayer there may be, but no true prayer fails of a true answer. But we may let the phrase stand under protest, and proceed to examine the puzzle.

Some of the alleged difficult cases are not hard to face for any one who possesses the true Christian

conviction of his own ignorance and the true Christian belief in God's wisdom. Our desire was not granted, because God knew better. But yet, if our will was rightly set to desire God's Will, our prayer was not wasted. God could see through the mistake of our application to the fundamental desire that we entertained for the doing of God's Will in God's way, and could use the force of our willing even while waving aside the application that we thought to give it.

God, therefore, granted the will of our heart, though not the desire of our lips; and granted it, let us be sure, in part because we willed it. None of the spiritual masters of Christendom, from our Lord downwards, has had any doubt that prayer works effects, that it is a creative contribution to God's result. It matters little how we justify this conviction. We may, as some do, put it thus, that as Christ could do no mighty work where He was met with unbelief, so God needs the right conditions to make His Will effectual, and that our prayer generates the sympathetic atmosphere in which God's desire may have free course.

Or we may take our stand on the fact of man's freedom to help or to hinder God. As by service, so by desire, I, because I am free, can contribute to the doing of God's Will. My will, which He gave me to use for or against Him, I take and empty into the stream of God's willing; and so I actually add to the force of its current, as by disloyalty I can obstruct it. Our desires, then, so far forth as we project them on God's side, are a body of power which He can use for His purposes. Each one of us who says and means 'Thy will be done' helps Him to make that Will effective.

But some of the hard cases are not so easy to face. For in them it seems as if it were certain that the desire was one which God must share. A mother prays that her son may 'run well.' She wants it because she loves him and loves God; and God, we are humbly sure, wants it too; and yet the effect does not follow. The answer to this difficulty lies hid in the mystery of iniquity. There is 'one that letteth.' So long as we see 'not yet' all things put under Christ's feet, so long, however we phrase it, have we to admit that in this or in that case the devil is yet too strong for God and man together. 'The devil is gone down to earth, having great wrath.'

Yet of one fact the Christian will be sure, that God's desire is such as Christ revealed it, a will of perfect love to all and to each. It is because she so believes that the Christian mother will carry her prayers even into the region of despair, that

she will pursue her son with her agonizing love even into the realm beyond this earth, and will be sure that God's love is pursuing him too, even into the city of dreadful night. She will feel that she is God's partner in desire and in the agony of desire frustrated; and so she will carry her cross and fill up that which is lacking in the sufferings of Christ, and still believe in God's love, though with a broken heart. When once Christian love gets to its knees in intercession for a loved one, it may have to suffer agonies as it beseeches; but it will not rise without the assurance, 'And thou too dost love the one I love.'

V.

Our brief study of this section of the Sermon on the Mount must draw to a close. Let us sum up the main truths that it has taught us. They are but two, and they are very simple. Firstly:

Prayer is natural. Man, God's child, natively desires that which is good. Prayer is the act by which the human soul seeks the air and food that minister true health to it. And secondly: Prayer works. Because God is our Father and has given freedom to us, His children, therefore, where God and man unite in desire, things happen. Prayer is the act in which we link our hands into God's to further His aims; therein the Divine desire and the human desire become fellow-workers; and from this partnership results follow. Of course, for 'a short time' the devil has power to frustrate that which God purposes. But 'I believe in God Almighty.' Because God is God, the final victory of His goodwill is sure. And for each of us the love and the service of that Will are the highest achievements to which we can aspire. To attain it is to reach the full growth of the human stature.

Two Remarkable Glosses in the Text of Hebrews.

By J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., BIRMINGHAM.

THE history of the text of the New Testament is, to an extent which has not been adequately realized, the history of its glosses, that is, of those expansions which are commonly regarded as improper accretions to the original narrative. If we could trace such accretions to their proper authors, or assign them to their approximate dates, we should certainly have done much to lift the study of textual criticism out of its present confusion as a *mêlée* of alphabets, numbers and signs and symbols. It must, however, be understood at the outset that no real progress can certainly be made so long as we speak of glosses in a sense which implies *petitio principii*. The supposed glosses may, in many cases, turn out to be part of the primitive text; there may have been reasons for removal, as well as grounds for insertion. In any case, we must not use the word 'gloss' as a 'question-begging epithet.' The study of such augmented passages, as in the Acts of the Apostles, for example, lies at the very heart of New Testament criticism.

I have recently been examining with some care a couple of these so-called glosses in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, neither of

which has the least prospect, in our present state of textual knowledge, of being given a position of dignity in the text, or a secure foothold in the apparatus to the text; they seem, however, to be deserving of some closer attention, in spite of the fact that Dr. Moffatt speaks of them contemptuously as being 'thrown up by the Latin version'; as if the Latin tradition was like the troubled sea of the Old Testament whose waters cast up mire and dirt! If the Latin tradition behaves in that way, and there is Greek attestation as well as Latin for the glosses referred to, we shall have Dr. Moffatt enlisted on the side of those who say that certain Greek MSS have latinized: for how else does the mud attach to them? But to come to our particular study.

The two glosses to which we refer are both of them in the roll-call of the deeds and the heroes of faith, which has for its formula the introductory words, 'By faith.' Two new instances are introduced, one of them referring to Moses, the other to the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. *By faith Moses*, and *By faith Israel*; so we may call them the 'By Faith' glosses, bearing in mind what we have said about avoiding preliminary pre-judications.

Our first gloss adds to the text of v.²³ the following words :

'By faith Moses, when he was grown up (μέγας γενόμενος) destroyed the Egyptian, observing (κατανοών) the humiliation of his brethren';

the second gloss is at the end of v.²⁸, and records that

'By faith they plundered the Egyptians when they went out.'

As regards the attestation of these two passages, it will be sufficient at this point to say that the former reading has both Greek and Latin support (the Greek evidence being that of the Codex Claromontanus, Cod. D, together with its transcript Cod. E, and another), and the latter reading has, as far as we know, only Latin support. There is no need to distract our minds by trying to decipher von Soden's hieroglyphics. Let us come to the subject-matter of the two new statements.

Each of them is concerned with the vindication of a doubtful passage in Old Testament morals: the first with the question whether Moses was a murderer who broke his own law; the second with the question whether the Israelites were robbers at the Exodus, who ran off with the jewellery of the Egyptian ladies. The similarity in the ethical problems involved invites the suggestion that the two 'By Faith' glosses are from the same hand. Perhaps they are due to an attempt at justification by faith in a non-Pauline sense. Each of them is related to objections made in very early times: the first has caused a reaction on the text of the New Testament itself; the second is meant to refute an objection made by the Marcionites, but which may very well be earlier than Marcion. Either of them, then, is early. Let us begin with Moses.

It is well known that the dispute between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses in the Epistle of Jude relates to this very question. The devil claims the body on the ground that Moses is a murderer. Satan was not afraid to speak evil of dignities, as St. Jude would say. Michael makes a stately, an almost contemptuous reply; the glossator in Hebrews has one which is more to the point. *Moses acted in faith.*

This was not the only case in which apology for Moses was necessary. His marriage with the Ethiopian girl was an early problem, which the Church solved (1) by the general rule laid down in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, that one is not to judge the actions of the prophets by ordinary standards; (2) by the explanation that the prophet

Moses was acting with a view to the mystery of the nuptials of Christ and the Church. Irenæus has preserved the argument for us as follows:

'By the nuptials of Moses, those spiritual nuptials of the Logos were intimated; and by his Ethiopian wife, the Church from the Gentiles was shown forth; and those who talk against her, and slander and make mock of her, shall not be reckoned pure (καθαροί). They shall be treated as lepers and put outside of the camp of the just.'

Irenæus is meeting objections of the primitive Puritans (καθαροί), and his retort is savage enough. Pure, indeed! they are lepers, rather. He is referring to the story of the way Miriam, the sister of Moses, was punished for criticising her brother's marriage.

To return to our theme. *Moses acted in faith when he killed the Egyptian.* The statement is meant to meet an early objection, and may, therefore, itself be early, or even original. Now with regard to the plunder of the Egyptians and their gauds and gear. As we said, it is well known that this is one of the Marcionite objections to the morality of the Old Testament; and Epiphanius explains that there was nothing wrong about it, since the Israelites were really only collecting wages for long years of unpaid servitude. We need not, however, spend time over Epiphanius. That we are dealing with a problem at least as old as the middle of the second century may be seen from the writings of Tertullian and Irenæus. The latter is especially interesting, for he devotes a whole chapter to the Spoiling of the Egyptians,¹ and in so doing he incorporates passages from the early Christian Father whom he calls 'the Presbyter,' who tackles the very same problem. Either, then, we have extracts from a lost *Presbyter against Marcion*, or we have a Presbyter against those who held Marcionite opinions before Marcion. Tertullian, Irenæus, and the Presbyter constitute a literature on the question of the Spoiling of the Egyptians, and it is with this literature that our second gloss must be classed. If it is not originally a part of the text, it can hardly be later than the middle of the second century. It is more simple as a solution than the laboured arguments of Irenæus, or even than those of the Presbyter.

It may, however, be worth while looking more closely into the statements of Irenæus, especially into the actual passage taken from the Presbyter in the following chapter. The underlying assumption is that the Exodus from Egypt is a type of the Exodus of the Church from among the

¹ *Adv. Haer.* lib. iv. cxxx. Mass.

Gentiles, and the Presbyter (is he Papias or some other allegorist of the time ?) says :

'We ought not to blame the Patriarchs and Prophets for those crimes of which the scriptures themselves accuse them, nor to become like Ham, who made mirth of his father's nakedness, and so fell under a curse ; but rather we ought to give thanks to God, since their sins were forgiven by the advent of our Lord ; and indeed they also ought to give thanks and to exult over our salvation. As for those accusations which the scriptures do not make, but only relate the events simply, it is not our business to become their accusers, nor to be wiser than our teacher, but to look for the involved type.'

The Presbyter has a simple solution for the Spoliation problem : the accounts are typical, and one must not bring railing accusations. Irenæus goes much further than this, and his extended treatment shows that the Church was in the grip of Marcion. His opponents affirm (and Irenæus does not deny it) that it was by the command of God Himself that the Israelites robbed the Egyptians of the silver and gold, the vessels and vestments which were ultimately employed in the structure and the service of the sanctuary.

'Qui vero exprobant et imputant, quod profecturus populus, jussu Dei, vascula omnis generis et vestimenta acceperit ab Aegyptiis, et sic abierit, ex quibus et tabernaculum factum est in eremo, ignorantes justificationes Dei et dispositiones ejus, semetipsos arguunt, *sicut et presbyter dicebat.*'

Irenæus argues that we are all of us in possession of wealth which we never acquired by our own efforts, as when we brought over with us from our Gentile days the proceeds of the Mammon of Unrighteousness into the Church. Some of it was due to the avarice of our ancestors or even of our friends. As to the Egyptians, if you come to that, they owed their life to the kindness and forethought of the patriarch Joseph ; how much was due on that account ? Then there is the long tale of toil, and of servitude ; what harm if they did take a little ? If they had been let alone, they would have become rich, and could have carried off a great deal. Do not we ourselves get something (yes ! and a very great deal) from quarters where nothing was due. Think of the Romans, from whom we have the peace of our time, and the right to come and go, by land or sea, without let or hindrance ! If we get so much for nothing, it is about time for us, when we talk of the Egyptians being spoiled, to begin to pick out the chip from our own eyes. We shall only excuse the fault-finding critic who gets nothing

from any one, and stands wholly indebted to the rest of the world, if he goes off into the mountains (naked, if you please) and lives with the beasts and like them. Thus, and more to the same effect, in the pages of the ingenious Irenæus. It is clear from the way that he piles up his argument that he has a great deal to answer. We contrast his reasoning with the simple statement of the glossator, that 'By faith they plundered the Egyptians, when they went out from among them.'

Tertullian meets the Marcionite objection in something the same manner as Irenæus, but he makes a legal statement of the situation between Israelite and Egyptian, just as if he had been engaged on one side of the case in the law courts, as follows (*C. Marcion*, ii. 20):

'The Egyptians put in a claim on the Hebrews for those gold and silver vessels. The Hebrews assert a counter-claim, alleging that, by the written engagement of both parties, there were due to them the arrears of that laborious slavery of theirs, for the bricks they had so painfully made, and the cities and palaces which they had built. . . . It would not be compensation enough, even if the labour of 500,000 men should be valued at only a farthing a day apiece,' and so on ; a pretty statement from a lawyer's point of view.

In Marcion's case the reference to the Spoliation of the Egyptians was made not merely to draw attention to an act of injustice involved in the Israelite history, but also to the contradiction between the God of the Old Testament and the good God of the New Testament. The case is stated for us in the *Dialogue* of Adamantius, which is the nearest we can get to Marcion's own utterances ; in this *Dialogue* we find the Marcionite Megethius contending as follows :

'The God of Creation commanded Moses when going forth from the land of Egypt, saying : "Be ready, with your loins girt, your feet shod, and staves in hand, with your wallets on your shoulders, and carry off gold, silver, and everything else from the Egyptians" ; but our Lord, the Good One, when sending out his disciples into the world, said, "No shoes on your feet, no wallet, no change of shirts, no money in your pockets." See how the Good One contradicts the rules of the other.'—Adamantius, *Dial.* 10.

So much for the Marcionite and anti-Marcionite points of view. For an Oriental justification of the right of plunder see Tabari, *Book of Religion and Empire* (ed. Mingana) (p. 155).

'And Moses—peace be with him . . . when he ordered the Children of Israel to leave Egypt and

go away, he told them that the Most High God had ordered that every one of them should borrow the garments of his neighbour and acquaintance and the jewels of their wives and daughters, and that they should inform them that it was for the occasion of one of their feasts. The Egyptian people yielded to them, adorned the Israelites with what they had, and lent them both their useful and necessary things. . . . The owners of these borrowed objects, and their wives and daughters, were deprived of their loaned articles; and their treasures, a griffin carried them away; and they bit their fingers out of regret. All this was not unlawful and illicit, but was simply the right of booty and spoils, for the world belongs to the Most High God, and its Kingdom and ornaments belong to those of His servants upon whom He bestows them, as He said in His book: "Thou givest the Kingdom to whomsoever thou plearest, and strippest the Kingdom from whomsoever thou plearest."

It is not necessary to assume that Tabari, who had apostatized from Christianity to Islam, had Marcionite statements (*pro* or *con*) before him: the ethical problem is more general than that raised by Marcion.

Now let us return to the first of our pair of glosses, which we have conjectured to come from the same hand.

The first thing we notice is that there is a repetition in the text when the gloss is inserted: as we commonly read it, we have as follows:

'By faith Moses, when he was full-grown (*μέγας γενόμενος*), refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, counting the reproach of Christ greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt, for he had respect to the recompense of the reward.'

To this we now add:

'By faith Moses, when he was full-grown (*μέγας γενόμενος*), killed the Egyptian, observing the humiliation of his brethren.'

Now to which of these accounts does the term 'full-grown' properly belong? If we turn to the

underlying narration in Exodus, we find in the text of the LXX as follows:

'And it came to pass after those many days that Moses, *now full-grown*, went out to his brethren the children of Israel; and *when he had observed their pain* (*κατανοήσας τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν*), he sees an Egyptian striking a Hebrew, one of his own brethren of the children of Israel.'

Here it is clear that the term 'when full-grown' belongs to the murder of the Egyptian. Further, it does not belong to the relation with Pharaoh's daughter, for, according to Josephus, this refusal of the royalty of Egypt *took place when Moses was a child*. We should accordingly expect that the Biblical text would begin with: 'By faith Moses, when he was little' (*ὅτε μικρὸς ἦν* or *ὅτε νέος ἦν*); and that the reference to his being full-grown should come later, in which case there is a strong argument for giving the gloss a place in the text. We should then have the sequence: 'Moses when he was born . . .' 'Moses when he was young . . .' 'Moses when he was full-grown.'

In that connexion we notice a peculiar dependence of the language of the gloss upon the text of the LXX. The Greek of the gloss is known to us from the Codex Claromontanus (D), and it is, as we have said before, suspect of Latinism. Over against *τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ* we have the Latin version '*dolorem fratrum ejus*.' Now this *dolorem* is again from the LXX, and answers to *τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν*. Probably *κατανοῶν* is also a Latinism for *κατανοήσας*.

The conclusion, then, is that the gloss is a Latin gloss, which may answer to a primitive passage in the text of Hebrews, and is certainly of very great antiquity: and as the two glosses belong to the same mint, what is said of one of them belongs also to the other.

If neither of them is a part of the original text, then *both* of them are anti-Marcionite additions to the text of Hebrews, and were inserted in early Latin copies in the first instance. It would be another case of what we note in the famous Western glosses of the Acts, that, if not a part of the text, they are certainly a part of the very earliest commentary upon the text.

In the Study.

Virginitas Querisque.

Learning to Pass.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
GLASGOW.

'Ready to distribute.'—1 Ti 6¹⁸.

THIS is the story of a very remarkable football team. Its name is not in any famous league, nor has it, so far as I know, ever won any celebrated cup. But it is a very remarkable team for all that. Its home is Beyrout in Syria, and it was organized by a young Scottish missionary. The centre-forward is an American, the forwards on either wing are Turks; a couple of Jews, a Negro, a Copt, and a few other international odds and ends make up a mixture that makes you think of the Tower of Babel. It sounds like mixing oil and water, or, rather, fire and gunpowder; for Turks and Armenians have been bitter enemies for centuries and are so still, and both dislike Jews, and all despise Negroes. Yet, there they were playing together in the same football team instead of trying to kill each other. What was it that made them lay aside old hatreds and old scorn like this? It wasn't just the fascination of football. Perhaps that drew them closer together and made them better friends; but it was something else which drew them together to begin with, and made them friends who had been so long enemies.

There is only one power that can work that sort of miracle, the power of Jesus. They were Christians. They had become friends with each other because each had first found a friend in Jesus. He is the Great Friend, and the first effect of His spirit in men is to make them friendly.

Now, then, do you know what was the most difficult thing for the missionary to teach them? It was to teach them to *pass the ball to one another*. Each one was eager to get the ball at his toe, to dart down the field and score a goal himself; and when the missionary had got a man to understand that he must play not for himself and his own glory, but for the team, when he had taught him to pass, he knew he had done a good bit of work not only for the team but for the man's own life. And that is just what we all need to learn in the greater game of life. St. Paul says Christians must be 'ready to distribute.' That just means that they must learn to pass. The world to-day is unhappy

and anxious, because every nation is playing its own game. They are fixed on their own plans. They want to mend the world in their own way. They want to score the goals and gather the glory single-handed.

This won't do in football. The selfish player spoils the team. The 'inside' that starves his wing man and won't pass must learn or he will find himself dropped. And it won't do in life, and things will never be right until each nation forgets itself and denies itself, looks 'not on its own things but on the things of others,' and all pull together for the good of all. Then the League of Nations will be a team; it is not a team yet.

In our own nation we see the same thing. We were one nation in the war, pulling together like one team, all ready to give up something for the sake of the nation. That is how we and our allies won the war. The splendid thing was when that great and good man, General Haig, offered to serve under General Foch. Now we are all at sixes and sevens again—miners, engineers, railway men, employers, workmen—each determined to score for himself, and nobody scoring at all for that very reason. It isn't a team when every man is playing for his own hand and won't pass to the next man; and we are not really a nation to-day in the full and perfect sense. We are just a lot of jostling people, not playing the game, not 'ready to distribute.'

This is the master secret for us all. The great lesson is to learn to pass. If you have comfort, it is not yours only. Pass it on. There are others being starved in the wings because you don't pass to them. They lose heart and drop out of the game discouraged. Pass on your comforts—your friendship, your money, your sympathy—pass, and play the game for the team and not for yourself. This is the spirit of Jesus. It is what He did, and being a Christian means being 'ready to distribute.'

Look farther than our own nation. We have good news to pass on, the good news of the love of God that has come to us through Jesus Christ. This is not for ourselves alone; it is for the world. There are millions in the world who know nothing about it. Pass it on to them. This is what we call 'Foreign Missions'; I call it 'Playing the Game.' These heathen folk are being starved

of what they have a right to, and a great need of.

God wants us all to be one, working like a team, all the nations together for God, all the people in each nation together for God, all for each and each for all. We are too fond of 'my' and 'mine,' but when Jesus taught His disciples to pray He left these words out and told them to use 'our'—'*our* father, *our* daily bread, *our* trespasses.'

And listen to the way St. Paul talks—'ready to distribute,' 'bear one another's burdens,' 'members one of another'—that is a team playing together under one Captain, Christ. 'If I come to Jesus,' we sing in a hymn, 'He will make me glad.' How? By teaching us to pass. It is the first lesson He will teach, it is the hardest to learn thoroughly, and it is the most worth learning, for it is the key that opens the door to an immense treasure of gladness.

Submarines.

BY THE REVEREND T. CROUTHER GORDON,
D.F.C., B.D., PITLOCHRY.

'Whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas.'—Ps 88.

One of the great things that passes through the sea is the submarine. You remember some months ago the H.29 sank when she was in her harbour. We were all very sorry when we learned that some of the crew were drowned. It brought back to us what happened during the war.

One day I was taken down in a submarine. It was lying in Portsmouth, and when we got aboard the commander took us out into the sea, and, when we were out of sight of land, he bolted up the conning-tower and barred up the holes, and then we sank farther and farther into the water. For a time we could see through the periscope, and we watched the waves passing over us, but soon the periscope too was under the water, and we could see nothing. Then the commander explained to us one or two of the instruments. One instrument, he said, tells me the speed I am going at. Another tells me if there is any ship near me, and this one tells me how deep I am. I stood watching this instrument. It had a large dial and a long pointer, and every second the pointer went farther and farther down. Ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty feet. We could breathe easily, there was plenty of air, there was nothing to tell us, except the pointer, that we were sixty feet below the waves. We did not feel ourselves going down, but the pointer told us.

And you and I, boys and girls, like the submarine, may go down and down, and yet not feel ourselves going down. You may think you are just as good as the next boy. He swears, and, when his father is not looking, he smokes too. He can tell as tall a story as you can. But, if you will just look at the pointer in your heart, you will see it pointing very low. And that pointer is your conscience.

In the middle of the submarine I noticed a seat. It was not like an ordinary chair. It was for all the world like a music-stool. And about three feet above the stool there was the bottom of the periscope, and there was a handle on each side of it for swinging it round. Now the commander of the submarine, when he is watching for the enemy, sits on that stool and swings the periscope round. And this lets him see all the ships that are near him on the ocean. But although he can see all round about him with the periscope, he cannot see straight above him. Now this is dangerous, for a seaplane might be flying right above him, and, before he could see it, it might drop bombs and destroy his boat. You see how very serious it might be for him and all the crew, because he could not see straight up.

And there are a great many boys and girls just like the commander in the submarine. They look round about them, but they do not look straight up, and they forget that God is watching them from heaven. And this leads to all kinds of evil. They do mean things, they say mean things about their chums, they let down their side when they are playing games. You don't do that, but boys and girls very like you do it. But if you will look straight up to God every night and every morning, you will keep clear of all trouble.

We were all very sad about the sinking of the H.29 submarine, but what made it very much sadder was that it sank just where it was lying in the harbour. It had come home from its cruise, and the damage was not done in the angry ocean, but when she was at home moored to the dock. She sank at her moorings.

I once knew a boy who lived in a house, and the name of the house was 'The Moorings.' Now you are living at home, and that is your mooring. But the sad thing is this, that so many are sinking just at their moorings. Not at school, where the teacher keeps them from talking, and where they dare not tell lies, but at home where we can go into a room all by ourselves and nobody sees us, and do things that we never tell to mother. Home, that is the place where you make your little sister do

what you want, because you say she is just your sister. It is at home that you lie in bed when you ought to be going to school. It is at home that you sit over the fire reading a detective story when you should be doing your sum until you get it out right. And so you must be very careful that you do not get lazy or fall into nasty habits, because, though it is sad that, like the submarine, you should sink and come to ruin, it is sadder still that you should sink into sin in your own home.

The Christian Year.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Eyes of Purity.

'Come and see.'—Jn 1³⁹.

'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'—Mt 5⁸.

'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' So Jesus reveals the condition of the beatific vision, and sets us in that cleft, more surely scored than that wherein Moses gazed on the retreating procession of God, from which we may look up and see God face to face.

1. What is this thing Purity? The answer is to be found in those Scriptures which the word and spirit of Christ inspired. It is both negatively described and positively revealed. In its negative aspect it is certainly *the negation of all that goes by the name of fleshly Lust*. The carnally impure see not God. Their passions create a red mist, which, though it be as rosy as the light in the cavern of the Venusberg in which Tannhäuser tarried, hides the face of God. This truth is native to the human spirit. The endeavour of our race to reach the wisdom and communion of eternal things is starved throughout its course with the forlorn conviction that they must be clean who would enter those holy mysteries. Humanity is in thrall to this conviction, and knows that all that is said by those who deride the Christian ideal of purity is given the lie by the oracles of its own heart.

'You complain of Catholicism,' said Chesterton's Mac Ian to the very modern Turnbull, 'for setting up an ideal of virginity; it did nothing of the kind. The whole human race set up an ideal of virginity: the Greeks in Athens, the Romans in the Vestal fire.'

It is this innate conviction in the race, that purity is the threshold of the shrine, and the shekinah that lights up God for us, which comes to its flower in the Christian revelation. Have you never been struck by the way in which the New Testament

links together such impurities as adultery, uncleanness, fornication, lasciviousness, and the like, with idolatry. Now the idolater does not see God; the block on which he gazes is a stumbling-block in the way of that holy vision. But let us detect this further, that, as those Scriptures reveal it to us, the idolater is set about by these impurities, and it is by their feverish hands the idol is so lifted up that the stars among which God waits for us are all obscured. Tennyson, in his Idyll of 'The Holy Grail,' makes very sure of this. It was impurity that barred from Sir Lancelot the vision of the Cup, that symbol and vehicle of the very blood of God. All that was 'pure, noble, and knightly' in him 'twined and clung round that one sin, until the wholesome flower and poisonous grew together, each as each, not to be pluck'd asunder.' Even when he came to Castle Carboneh, down the hall of which the Cup floated in luminous air, it was veiled from Lancelot. 'A stormy glare, a heat as from a seven-times-heated furnace, blasted and burned and blinded' him. It was his own heart heated with his unexorcised passion that bred that blinding storm!

2. But now let us note that Purity means freedom from other humours than lust. It means also *freedom from Pride*. No man who regards himself as sufficient for himself may hope to 'see God.' Still less if his pride be that of material possessions and worldly pomps in which he has laid up his soul. 'Pride,' as one has written, 'is a weakness in the character; it dries up laughter, it dries up wonder, it dries up chivalry and energy.' With such drought the wells of God dry up for a man, and he beholds no more than a mirage of fountains among their groves. Thus it is that many thinkers of our own day cannot see more of God than a dream that the world had of Him in its superstitious childhood, or a dream which the Universe in its slow labour is 'unconsciously' trying to bring true. They cannot because of pride, an intellectual self-sufficiency which limits the things that man may know in heaven and earth to their own philosophy. They lack that humility and selfless reverence by which alone Truth comes with her sensitive approach within our compass. St. Peter in his Epistle declares that we purify our souls by obedience to the truth. So; but it is by purifying our minds from pride that we first of all address ourselves to that 'obedience.' All revelations come only to those who, as Maeterlinck says, accustom themselves 'to live like an angel who has just sprung to life, like a woman who loves, or a man on the point of death.' In these moods there is no

room for self-sufficiency. And the vision of God needs that vacancy of the proud self more than all else. No one may hope to have even a 'sense of God,' to use William Watson's phrase, until he banishes pride in himself :

When, overarched by gorgeous night,
I wave my trivial self away ;
When all I was to all men's sight
Shares the erasure of the day ;
Then do I cast my cumbering load,
Then do I gain a sense of God.

3. In the third place, Purity means *freedom from Scorn*. The flavour of this spirit grieves us in the words of those who, having 'outgrown' the antique and workaday conception of 'God,' seem content to wander among those half-formed shapes and incipient divinities which whisper about their self-sufficient minds, and call to them dumbly in the twilight created by their own thought. They carry themselves scornfully to the 'humble and meek,' and so sterilize their own fields. At times their scorn becomes hate. Jesus was subjected to this. 'They have seen,' said He, 'and they have hated both me and my Father.' Scorn is the flavour of the greater part of Thomas Hardy's treatment of those who will not and cannot share his bleak agnosticism. No doubt he has kinder moods, but he has so overborne those childlike thoughts in his heart, and set forth their dead bodies with gentle scorn, that that revelation which is denied to the 'wise and learned,' but revealed to babes and the 'simple-minded,' has passed him by.

Childlikeness, 'simple-mindedness,' humility, a heart that brings all its native simplicity of response to the light which shines behind the commonplace—these are the positive elements in that purity by which we 'see God.' It is a spirit which tends to shepherds telling of what they saw and heard on the hills, as readily as to princes of learning who come over to us, purged of their faith, in the wake of 'the high, white star of Truth.' It is a spirit which seeks the oracle of the Academy or the Porch with no humbler a reverence than it shows to a teacher of little tales about sheep and shepherds, sowing and reaping, sparrows and daffodils, women cleaning houses or baking bread. It is true that this vagrant prophet begat a superstition which has filled the earth with temples, books, worship, and incredible adventures. But what good thing can come out of Galilee? Whatever it be need not concern us! Thus those who

assume the leadership of thought among us pass Christ by.

It is this attitude of quiet contempt or sheer ignorance where the Galilean is concerned that hinders these men from 'seeing God.' They have not yet sufficiently learned the fundamental lesson about God, that it is the 'pure in heart' who see Him. Some of them, like Huxley, have learned well that the scientific mind cannot read the truth of a flower, or find the law that is held in a child's daisy-chain, unless they 'sit down before it like a little child.' But they have yet to try that scientific method towards Christ. How many of them do so? They read books, many or few, that are critical of religion, or they hear of Christ by the weary hearing of the ear. But as for going face to face with Him as He gathers the childlike about Him in the Gospels, that is the last thing many of them have ever thought of doing. If they will but do so, and suffer their soul to *take* upon itself the direct glow and impress of His soul, with no other spirit of submission than they offer when they sit with Huxley before the face of Nature, *they shall in Christ see God!* They shall know that they have reached God.

Whoever or whatever God be, we have all come forth from Him. We live in Him as intimately, surely, as the animalcule lives in our body. Every breath we draw depends on the pulse that beats out its vital rhythm from the heart that throbs in the Innermost. Can it be, therefore, that we should light at any time or anywhere upon the home and heart of this our parentage, and not know that we had discovered it? It cannot be. It cannot be that a bird of the air knows by the prompting of its homing heart when and where it has come home, and the soul of man stand blind and irresponsible when he lights on God. It is this 'instinct,' or 'intuition,' or 'sense of the holy' which knows that, in meeting Christ, God is met, that they who have seen Him have seen the Father!¹

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Value of Religious Reserve.

'See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.'—Mt 8⁴.

The Gospels are no doubt full of instances of our Lord's desire to efface Himself, to escape the foolish notoriety with which the wonder-lust of the multitude surrounds every true greatness to its real

¹ A. Boyd Scott, *The Twelve Take Stock of Us*, 53.

belittlement. Yet there is surely something more in the deliberate gravity of this command. It is not of Himself He is thinking, but of the man to whom He speaks. It is a lesson, not a request. It is the lesson of religious reserve and religious sincerity.

Every religious experience is profoundly real and personal. And just because it is so, it will feel the tug of two conflicting impulses, neither of which is to be immediately trusted. It will want to declare itself, and it will want to hide itself. Everything that touches what is most personal in us comes as a renewal. A great joy that comes to us apart from our deserts or beyond them, a great purpose that takes possession of us, a great success which, however much it may have been hoped for, will always seize us with the sense of the unexpected—these things renew us, or we are incapable of being renewed. But indeed there is none of us such a clod as not to feel the thrill of a new life, however feeble, however evanescent, through such visitings. And even a great sorrow or a great failure will try whether there is life in us to be renewed or only the hopeless dulness of a stagnant spirit to be more painfully endured than before. And if renewal comes, however it comes, it wants to express itself. It is an expansive moment, and at the same time it is a morbid moment—a moment both of feverish self-expression and of unhealthy reserve. At such times we would say everything and say nothing; we would take the world into our confidence and again withdraw into a moody and stubborn loneliness of spirit.

Both moods are dangerous, or rather would be dangerous if they could prove permanent. They both witness to the soul's concern about itself. They may be innocent and harmless in that moment of the renewal of life. But they have no permanent correspondence with the stern and somewhat prosaic demands of life as a whole. And so it is well that from the beginning we should be taught to avoid them or rather to conquer them. And that was our Lord's lesson to the leper whom He had healed. He knew the inevitable impulse which would drive the poor victim of a loathsome disease, who suddenly found himself clean, to proclaim abroad the great miracle of his cleansing. He knew, too, the vacancy of spirit, of will, which the very excess of joy can induce in us. And so He uttered the double warning: 'See thou tell no man; but go, shew thyself to the priest and make the customary offering.'

Do we not feel the general significance of this warning? All strength is full of a noble reserve.

And the feeling that would acquire strength and self-certainty must learn this lesson of reserve. Our Lord indeed spoke only to the need of a particular moment. When He said, 'See thou tell no man,' He was not counselling a habitual secretiveness. For such secretiveness is the reserve of the cowardly or the cunning. The nature that is sure of itself needs no concealment and has no temptations to concealment. There is a splendid freedom and a fine appropriateness in all its self-revelation. It is incapable of weak concealment and of weaker boasting. But it is when one is learning to be strong that it is necessary to keep watch on the waywardness of the spirit. It is then that we need to remember our Lord's counsel, 'See thou tell no man.' For to that stage in the soul's growth it was directed. It is the moment when self-expression may too easily become self-betrayal. We may think we are only uttering a spontaneous gratitude. But when we give ourselves time to think, when we have gained the power of dealing sincerely with ourselves and look back upon that moment of expression, we recognize in it the momentary intoxication of an unworthy vanity. It was of ourselves we were thinking, of the something great that had happened to us. It was not the miracle of renewing power in itself that had impressed us. It was the fact that we were the objects of it. It was that which had unloosed our tongues and at the same time had weakened the real reverence in our hearts.

Are not much religious profession and confession of this puny kind? We dare not, indeed, make loose charges against any particular form of religious expansiveness. But at least let us be sure for ourselves that we never dare to speak of the things that have come to have the most profound meaning for us till the need comes which we dare not resist, till silence would prove itself a greater betrayal than speech. And let us honour the great silent natures about us from whose lips we have never heard any of the current religious phrases, but whose quiet steadfast lives have so often been our reproof and our inspiration.

But, it may be argued, the great religious teachers were not afraid to urge their own experience upon their disciples. If they had been they would never have made disciples. St. Paul's teaching is surely personal enough. It might seem, indeed, at times to be an almost extravagant insistence upon what he himself had felt. He seems unable to recommend a general truth save through what had been immediately personal to himself. It is true, and more than that, it is doubtful whether

any religious teacher has ever spoken with effect save out of his own personal certainties. Yet St. Paul provides the very example to which we would appeal in support of what has been said. For in him the personal has become the universal, and it has become somehow the universal pleading with each. If he speaks of himself, it is not that we may take note of him personally, it is that we may see in him what we can be and have and know, it is that we may feel through him who has known it something that is the common need and hope of humanity. The secret of St. Paul is that when he speaks of himself most directly, when he places himself in the very centre of the picture, he has entirely forgotten himself, he hardly knows that he exists or counts. 'Not I, but Christ that dwelleth in me.'

The merely individual experience, the experience which feels its separateness, rejoices in it, and exposes itself lightly, does not exist in St. Paul's religion. His is the experience which has ceased to be merely individual and become truly personal, representative of what a broadly human experience may be and ought to be. For the personal is the note of the Divine life, of the life that can be wholly itself and yet can enter into communion with all other life that is; and we never completely attain it. The individual is the note of unregenerate human life, of the life that cannot be itself at all without insisting on its separateness; and we never wholly escape it. And all the genuine religious experience of the human soul is an ascent from the merely individual to the truly personal. Here is the key to the true and worthy religious reserve.

And again there is great meaning in that other counsel of our Lord's, 'Go and shew thyself to the priest and make the offering that is customary.' It is the temptation of every religious feeling which is at all really individual to be self-sufficient. It tends to ignore customary religious forms, to feel itself magnificently independent of them. There seems to it something cold and insufficient in their formal routine. Yet it is just then that the soul needs the correction and discipline which they can supply. We need to be humbled by the bracing discipline of the common levels.

'Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.' Only that, and yet, if we obey, we will learn that the renewal which might have proved fruitless and illusory is at last beginning to accomplish itself in us in earnest.¹

¹ A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 34.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

HARVEST SERMON.

God's Disapproval of a Grudging Spirit.

'When thou cuttest down thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands.'—Dt 24¹⁹.

It is quite evident, to any one who reads the Book of Deuteronomy with attention, that it was written for people who were still in touch with country life. It deals with a state of things which has not yet become too complicated. The people to whom it addresses itself in the name of God—and this it does with a frankness which is very refreshing in these more sophisticated days of ours—are not very numerous. It is still possible to reduce all moral and religious life to a few plain precepts. At a later stage, when a population has come within sight of other civilizations and manners, words have lost their first meaning, and people's minds have become so subtle, so full of excellent arguments for whatever course suits themselves, that they cannot—unless in certain dark and tragical hours—feel the one tremendous call of life, the one holy and inevitable meaning which alone gives sense and substance to this human scene.

There are a few simple rules which have been right from the beginning, rules which it will always be necessary for us to observe if we would please God and have the comfort of our own thoughts. Always be careful when you hear it said of some simple old rule, that 'times are changed,' that what was once excellent enough is now no longer suitable! Times are changed; but human hearts are scarcely changed at all. A good man in our day is very like what a good man must have been in the time of Moses. Goodness is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. You may dash along the streets or along our railways at a speed which would have astonished our simple ancestors and put them for a moment at a disadvantage; but the moment you alight, the moment you are tempted to commit a sin, the moment you beat your breast over some sin committed, the moment you meet some disaster in the region of your love or your fortune, the moment you become aware of your own *self*—in that moment you are the same. Since God first spoke to man the rules for the true life have not been changed. All that has happened is that we have to play our part in other circumstances.

Therefore let us be on our guard when we are

told that some old rule for good-living is no longer applicable to our case, that some fine action which used to be the sign of a beautiful and religious spirit is not incumbent upon people like ourselves in these present days. 'When thou reapest thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it : it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, for the widow ; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands.'

A verse like that takes us back in a moment to man's simple days ; it may be to our own simpler days. For one moment we see golden fields, and the labour and the joy of harvest.

When the people of God were at that stage in their long career, here is a rule which God laid upon them—a rule which their own conscience must have accepted as good. When a man was clearing a field of grain, if he happened to forget a sheaf, he must *leave* it—and the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow should have it. A man is not asked deliberately to leave one sheaf behind—for the poor : that would have been the very opposite of the spirit of this law. He is not asked to look about him as the last load is leaving his field, and to say, ' Ah, yes, I see I have left one sheaf behind '—and then to go away, as though by leaving that one miserable sheaf he had discharged all his obligations to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. If you consult the laws of Moses you will find that very much more was expected of any man who claimed to be a good man.

Imagine for a moment the condition of the man who—knowing this law of his God with regard to the forgotten sheaf—goes back to fetch it. He has set out for the last time from his field walking by the side of his waggon. He has that tired and happy feeling which comes in the evening after a good day's work. God, too, has crowned the year with His goodness. So the man walks on, making melody in his heart unto the Lord—now and then cheering on his patient beast with some playful word. So they go on, the man and the beast and the golden grain, just as God, from all eternity, had proposed. Suddenly he comes to a standstill. He summons his beast to halt—he remembers that he has forgotten a sheaf ! So back they go, man and beast, and grain no longer golden, but dull with the growing darkness. He finds the gate, passing some of the poor people—the strangers, the fatherless, and the widow—who had come to gather up the crumbs that had fallen from his table ! For a moment he is uneasy ; but he recalls his own excellent point about encouraging strangers, and

passes doggedly on.—He finds his sheaf, flings it on the top of the waggon, beats his poor beast—as though it were to blame—and hastens homewards. But there is no song now in his breast !

We are not farmers, but there is something in that old rule or custom which we must find out for ourselves as applying to ourselves. Every word which God ever spoke to man *stands*. It abides in spirit. And what is the spirit, the permanent challenge and demand of that ancient law of early Israel ? It is just this : that we are all of us to practise a certain open-handedness in life. We are not to squeeze the last penny out of life—for our own sakes. We are not to make the great error—that we are here to wring out of life the last drop that will minister to our luxury or to our ambition. On the contrary, we are here to sit loosely to the world, thanking God if we have what we really need. We live in a world of men without whose friendship and assistance there are dark places in life which we should never pass alone. We are here not simply in order that we may get home in the evening with everything that we can legally claim and can heap up on our waggon. On the contrary, when all is said, we are here to leave something behind ! To every man God has given a field on which to labour—until the evening. And God knows that we ourselves have need of bread and raiment. But unhappy surely is the man who, in order to minister to his own vanity, in order to promote his own ease and luxuriousness, leaves behind him a barren track as though a plague of locusts had passed that way !

It may not have been a good thing for those strangers, for those fatherless people and those widows, to learn to depend upon farmers leaving sheaves behind them in the fields. It may indeed have been a very bad thing for them, encouraging them in indolence and destroying their independence—although the Bible has little to say in praise of what we call 'independence.' And it may have been, socially, a harmful practice—this leaving of sheaves. But that is not the point. The point is that no man can look at himself with comfort who, having forgotten a sheaf, and remembering that poor people are looking for it, goes back—though his waggon is already laden—to fetch it.

Our blessed Lord once spoke a parable of a poor man sitting begging at a rich man's door. Our Lord did not there encourage begging. All that He did in that parable was to rebuke a man's hardness of heart. All that He did was to follow in imagination that hard-hearted man into a place

of utter loneliness where he could not but think of himself and of the miserable thing he had done.¹

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

After Summer.

'The summer is ended.'—Jer 8²⁰.

We are all more or less sensitive to our environment, influenced and impressed by the scenery that is about us. The days are different; the seasons come and go; and in the changing face of Nature we find the mirror of our moods, the reflection of our experiences. When autumn days are here, the gladness and glee of the year have gone, and there is a tender sadness over the landscape. The corn is all cut and carried away; and we look across the pale stubble-fields, bare and empty—all stripped of their abundant loveliness; and we know that there has passed a glory from the earth. 'The summer is ended.'

Let us take one or two thoughts that such a word brings to us.

1. 'The summer is ended.' That is true, but let us thank God that we have seen another summer. It is something to be thankful for. No doubt, our first thought is the thought of what is gone. It is the difference between spring and autumn, like the difference between morning and evening. The glory of morning is that the light is breaking and growing and coming, and all the bright hours are yet before us. But when evening comes, the light is fading, diminishing, and the shadows creep on. So in the spring-time we live in hope for all the glory that is yet to be. There comes to us the promise of the summer with its wealth of life and beauty, its long, light, lovely days. But in autumn we think of what is gone.

'The summer is ended.' We have seen it; and what a season it has been of bounty and of beauty. We can remember days when it was good to be alive, out on the hills or by the sea, in field and wood, the sunshine and the skies, the sweet air, the radiant health, the verdure and the loveliness of trees and flowers. God gave us such summer days. Have we thanked Him for them? Such a world it is, telling of His delight in His creation and the love with which He loves us. 'The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord,' and of this fulness have all we received. Ended? Yes; but we have seen it again, seen it come and go, another spring and summer, the bloom and freshness, the wonder and delight. And in our brief life it means

much. Henry Ryecroft writes in his *Journal*, after he had retired to the country: 'How many more springs can I hope to see? A sanguine temper would say ten or twelve; let me dare to hope humbly for five or six; that is a great many. Five or six spring-times welcomed joyously, lovingly watched from the first celandine to the budding of the rose, who shall dare to call it a stinted boon? Five or six times the miracle of earth reclad, the vision of splendour and loveliness which tongue has never yet described set before my gazing. To think of it is to fear that I ask too much.'

'Forget not all his benefits.' It is a great boon to be here alive and to have seen another summer.

2. Another thought is this. 'The summer is ended,' and we know what comes next. The year changes from sunny skies and soft showers and warm winds to storms and snows. But the gladness and the good have not gone from us. Winter has its own beauty and its own keen, eager life. Certainly the winter landscape has a loveliness all its own; and when we step out into the frosty air, or when we battle bravely against wind and rain, we feel the bracing influence of harder weather. The keen air does not depress; it quickens and invigorates. Frosty, but kindly, are the winter days, and soon we lose the sense of gloom and still rejoice. It is not difficult to see that for our health and vigour, and for our highest life, we need what winter brings to us. How clear the contrast between the races of tropical countries, self-indulgent and indolent, and those who are trained and disciplined in the more rugged and severe climate of the North!

It is this season, too, that gives us all our indoor life. Indeed, 'home' is a northern word—a word not found in sultry, southern climes, not found where men are living out of doors. Only among those whom the cold drives to seek shelter and retreat, only at the hearth where the winter fire is kindled and the family gathered—there we know the life, the fellowship, the intimate bonds of love that make us live together and be at home.

We should not complain of our rugged climate. There is a moral influence in the severity after the softness; and we may thank God for the frosts and snows and sleets and bleak winds, even as when we see such changes reflected in our life, in hardship and suffering and adverse fortune. There are mild and genial influences under which we may expand and grow; but there are also influences that are helpful though hard, kindly though cold.

3. 'The summer is ended.' For most of us it means this too—coming home again, and coming

¹ J. A. Hutton, in *Harvest Thanksgiving Sermons*, 131.

home to our work. The holiday is past—the time of lighter, freer life ; and we face the winter—the time of more steady, settled, strenuous work. We shrink a little from the first plunge into it. We know the feeling of the first days in the collar. But still we know that this is good—for life is work.

It is essential to any real welfare of spirit, essential to healthy-mindedness, that we should have a clear perception and a hearty acceptance of the work God gives us to do, finding in it what gives substance and value, dignity and nobleness to life. It is good to sit in the sunshine, to wander over moor and shore enjoying those hours of freedom and repose which are so healthful and so happy. But it is not enough. We find ourselves thinking of our work, looking forward to the winter days, planning some better method, cherishing a deeper desire to work well. We cannot satisfy ourselves with sport and play and pleasure. It is not these that contribute the elements of real strength and worth to our life. And it is good that we should remind ourselves of this when 'the summer is ended,' and our work is again in our hands.

We measure our life most truly when we are looking back upon it. And this is the only reflection and remembrance that awakens a satisfaction deep in the heart: 'I have finished the work.' Life is work and play, and there are just two kinds of life. There is one that makes the work less than the play—when we work in order that we may play. There is another that makes the play second to the work—when we play in order that we may work better.

4. Take this last reflection which is the thought of the text. 'The summer is ended'; another season has passed.

The text has an interesting meaning here which few of those who repeat it think of. It has most likely a political reference. Threatened by the great power of Assyria, the land of Judah was looking to Egypt for help, but the help did not come. The summer days passed. The time of campaigning was over. Kings do not go forth to war in winter. The long summer went past and

there was no sign of help. The prophet hears the cry of the captive people, carried away by the victorious invader, because the hopes they cherished had been cherished in vain as they looked to Egypt through the summer months and no help came. 'The summer is ended, and we are not saved.'

But the words have passed into our common speech as a cry of despair over lost chances, seasons that have come and gone and been missed or misspent.

It is evidently true of the harvest. It is like another proverb taken from agriculture: 'Make hay while the sun shines.' It carries the same lesson of opportunity to be swiftly, diligently used or lost for ever. Harvests must be reaped in harvest-time. And it is true of our passing life. Like the year life is a succession of times and seasons, each of which has its destined work ; and that being done, all is well ; that left undone, all is not well.

God gives us our times—seed-time and harvest, and summer and winter. This is the Divine discipline under which we live. Large opportunities are put in our way, and it is left with ourselves whether we shall use them or neglect them. There is no coercion to compel us to turn them to account ; and the wheels of time will not be reversed to bring them back once they are gone. There are measured opportunities in life—soon spent, easily lost, never recovered. What a wonderful gift is this of time ! A little section cut out of eternity and given us to do our work in, the season in which we are saved or lost. Do we not feel it more and more with every returning season when 'the summer is ended' and the year sinks to its close ? It may seem safe enough in spring-time to laugh and sing and play when every day brings summer nearer, when every day is longer than the day that went before it. But life has another aspect when the autumn leaves are falling and the winter storms begin. We realize that life is going from us ; and life is opportunity. It is 'this thy day,' and if we miss it, our day is done.¹

¹ J. Rutherford, *The Seer's House*, 307.

The Education of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND H. C. CARTER, M.A., CAMBRIDGE.

WE have a right to look to the facts, so far as we can know them, of the conditions under which Jesus grew up, as showing us the type of the perfect

human education. For a perfect man there is needed a perfect germ of personality, and a perfect education—processes and conditions forming the

environment of his growth perfectly adapted to the drawing out of the personality and its completeness. That combination was found in the history of Jesus. May there not be more for our guidance and imitation here, in the midst of our puzzled thoughts and experimentings about education, than it has commonly occurred to us to look for? If we may know the main conditions under which the best—the infinitely best—human life grew to perfection, and if, further, we can see that those conditions are, in their principle, reproducible, is it not to be believed that the life of Jesus has been given us in this respect, as in others, for our example? If the perfect seed needs the best soil to grow in to bear the perfect flower and fruit, does the imperfect seed, of the same species, do better with another soil?

Let us then think of the great things we know—and we only know a few great things—about Jesus' education. We may distinguish six facts of importance: six influences under which He grew to perfect manhood.

1. There was first *the home into which He was born*, in which He lived all His days until His powers were fully ripe.

In after years, in order that He might fulfil the mission on which He had come into the world, Jesus abandoned His home. Perhaps, in spite of all the thought that has been bestowed upon His sufferings, enough has never been given to the cost which that renunciation meant to Him. But as we look at the earlier part of His life and ask under what conditions His powers of body and mind and spirit were developed, there stands in the forefront this fact, that Jesus grew to manhood amid the sheltering sanctities of a home. It is to the home that the Gospels first take us, and the way it was prepared for.

There was the preparation of the mother. The mistake that a great part of Christendom has made of worshipping that mother has perhaps turned away the mind of another part of it from giving her the reverence that is plainly her due. One evangelist, St. Luke, has preserved for us a picture of Mary—such as no imagination could have invented—which enables us to know, and not simply to guess, that the greatest of the sons of men was born of the best of women. Read the story again for what it tells of Mary; of how the news of her pain and honour was borne, the humility and the joy, the spirit open to the vision of God, and the tongue loosed in His praise. 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. . . . From henceforth all generations

shall call me blessed.' Mary was a great religious poet, with a poet-power born not made, born in the heart of simplicity and devotion. Jesus came into this world already loved in the love of God by such a mother. And for all His years in that home Jesus was by that mother's side—that mother who kept things, pondering them in her heart—learning from her lips and quiet deeds, prayed for and thought for every day, loved with the richest, deepest human mother-love.

And then there was a father in that home—Joseph, the carpenter. This only we know of Joseph, that he was chivalrous, tender, and true. The little that has been told assures us of that. How long he lived through the growing up of Jesus to do the office of human father to Him we do not know. We know that it was until He was more than twelve. They knew Jesus at Nazareth, when He was a man, by His father's name, so that father was by then at least not forgotten. 'Is not this,' they said, 'the son of Joseph?' And to forsake fact only for a moment to make a guess—can we think that when Jesus used the name of Father for the one whom He so early came to know as His true eternal Parent ('Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?'), He was not lifted upwards to an understanding of all that heavenly fatherhood meant through what He had known the father in His earthly home to have been? 'Which of you that is a father,' He said to the men of Galilee, 'will fail to give your children such good things as you can afford? How much more that heavenly Father?' Surely He thought of Joseph, and the kindness that had been constant in that home in Nazareth.

In that home were brothers and sisters too. What do we know of them? Nothing, except that they loved Him well enough to trouble greatly when, without true understanding, after He had left the home to do His great work, they thought He was running in paths of danger. They sought to restrain Him. We know nothing except that, and this—that they saw no wonderful sign of their brother's being more than human, as He grew up and worked and played with them in that home. They 'saw no glory' crown His head.' For we read that when He came forth as a prophet 'his brethren did not believe on him.' What legend-weavers would have invented that? It bears the mark of fact.

In this home, among brothers and sisters, with all the social life such a home must mean, Jesus grew up; surrounded by the comradeship of those of her boys and girls; surrounded by the love and

teaching of that mother and father. But something else—trained in obedience to that mother and father: 'He was subject unto them.' That was the early setting in which the perfect life of Jesus was developed.

2. The second leading condition of the growth of Jesus follows in close connexion with His home. He was brought up *in contact with the simplicities of human life*—its elemental needs, and difficulties, and delights.

'Give me neither poverty nor riches,' prayed the wise man. Such was the condition given to Jesus' growing manhood. It was a home where the daily bread was not scarce, but earned with labour, and received as the gracious requital of God, blessing honest toil. It was a working man's home; a home equally removed from penury and from luxury. It was a home where the boy within it had daily kept before His eyes the fact, lost sight of at great peril, that the life of man here depends upon the work that brings food out of the ground, upon the diligence and skill that shapes the raw material of nature to his needs to clothe and shelter him and give him comfort.

And Jesus was taught a trade—to do something of real and apparent use for His fellows, to make handles for their ploughs and sickles, beams and rafters for their dwellings, beds for them to lie on. 'Is not this the carpenter?' Jesus was brought up to know the need, and the delight, of simple toil; to know it under conditions where the product of a man's labour might stand beside him as its reward under conditions of freedom, where no fellow-man might command his services as of right, or own him as a 'hand'; yet under the conditions of necessity, where idleness was plainly doomed, and the law was written clear, 'If a man will not work, neither shall he eat.'

Here was another part of the setting of the growing up of Jesus—another part of that education which issued in proved perfectness of character.

3. The third thing we may see as we look at these conditions amid which Jesus grew is that this setting of His developing life was *in nearness to the works of God in Nature*. Amid all the social influences of home, and of a community which provided for the exercise of a craftsman's and a tradesman's services, He grew up nevertheless close to the fields and hills. God provided for the making of the manhood of His perfect Son a place where town and country touched each other. The Bible represents the paradise of man's innocence as a garden; but it draws the paradise of his perfect-

ness as a garden city, where the river and the trees are in the streets. Nazareth was not a garden city; but it was a country town. Jesus was not brought up in the dark gloom of a slum, nor in the heavy grandeur of an opulent city, nor in the trim respectability of a comfortable suburb. He grew up in a little town where workers and those they worked for lived within sight of one another, where there were the problems of a town which come from people living close together, yet where the blue of the sky could be seen clear, and a man might look at the hills even from where he worked, and walk out upon them in the evening, and watch the corn grow and see the birds and hear their song.

It was at Nazareth that Jesus had seen the wild lilies clothed more gorgeously than Solomon; it was at Nazareth He had watched and learned how the corn is sown, and how it falls where the sower casts it, and which of it has the best chance of growing well. There He saw the weeds growing among the good grain, and saw the reapers at their glad work of harvesting. At Nazareth He watched the rain and the sun and learned from them lessons of God's impartial goodness. There He watched the fiery red sunsets and heard the farmers' prophecies of fine or foul weather. On the hillsides of Nazareth He learned the ways of shepherds, and how they cared for one lost sheep.

Was all this nothing for the growing up of Jesus, to be the one of all the world of men who has read most clearly God's handwriting in the open book of Nature? The country was surely an instrument in Jesus' education.

4. But what of His growing up in *knowledge of the world*, its great affairs—all the world of secular life, of old and current history, of politics—all that goes to make the necessary stock of a man's mind for his intelligent mixing in the world? Now here we cannot pretend that we can find much of certain fact to guide us. We may assume, of course, that Jesus, mixing with the men of Nazareth, talking with them in the market-place, came to know all such things as they knew. But this we may note: that Nazareth was a good place for getting knowledge of the world. Men did not learn by newspapers then. News flew from mouth to mouth along the roads. And Nazareth was near some of the great roads. The Emperor's armies and his couriers, merchants—the chief news carriers—pilgrims, adventurers, all passed beneath its hills. It was a place where a man could scarcely live and keep ignorant of what was passing in that great Roman world.

And when we read the words of Jesus that so often speak of kings and their servants, and armies and courts, we are striking on reflections of the things He had seen and spoken of and brooded over often in Nazareth. There in the little country town He had had rare chances of knowing much of the power and magnificence of that Roman Empire whose glory filled the earth. When He entered upon His life's work He was tempted by a vision of the kingdoms of the world and of possessing them for His own. He had learned at Nazareth to know what that meant.

All this was another real part of the equipment and preparation of Jesus to become the perfect Man. He learned to know the outstanding facts about the world He was to die to save.

5. But now we come to something even more important. The fifth element that we may distinguish in the education of Jesus is this: He was *nurtured in the religious tradition of the people of God*. He learned the Scriptures, so that in after days they were His armoury for attack and defence against evil spirits and evil men. 'It is written.' 'How readest thou?' His soul was nourished upon what Moses and all the prophets had written. He learned there what He was called to be—the suffering Saviour of His people and of the whole world. Those lessons in Scripture began at His mother's knee. And His earthly father doubtless took them up, as every true Jew did and still does for his boys. 'Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children.' And then there was the Synagogue school, and the Synagogue worship. When He came back to Nazareth, as a prophet, only to be despised as one they knew there too well, we read, 'He came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and he entered the synagogue, as his custom was, on the sabbath day.' He had been there from boyhood. And then from twelve years old there had been those visits to Jerusalem for the Passover feast—the crowding thoughts and emotions of those visits, the eager questioning of the religious leaders of His loved people, the flooding sense that here, of all places on earth, was His Heavenly Father's home and His Heavenly Father's business. On that first visit it all crowded out for a time His thought of His earthly home and His parents. It was the boy, with a real boy's mind and heart, awaking to the near reality of God—God who had been coming to Him, arousing His own consciousness within Him, through all those earlier years when He had been learning line by line out of the book of His revelation and the fellowship of His Church.

So Jesus grew to perfect manhood nurtured in the religious tradition of His people—the people of God. The truth of God—which was the truth of His own inner being, as of none other who ever lived—dawned upon His consciousness and grew and grew to fulness. Jesus had an education in religion. Under it He developed in God-consciousness, till He became Himself the perfect revelation of God to men.

6. We must speak of one more, a sixth element that belonged to the conditions of Jesus' development. There came *a crisis, and a dedication*. In His now mature manhood a great religious movement shook the feeling and the conscience of the people among whom He lived, like a breeze stirring the waters of some lake out of stagnancy. John the Baptist arose with his trumpet call to repentance: and men's hearts were moved with fear and expectation.

Into the midst of that movement Jesus came forth. His hour had come. The summons had been heard to do the work for which He had been sent into the world. And it came through the voice of John calling to his baptism. Jesus went to be baptized of John. He must be with His people utterly in their turning to God when His prophet called. And there the seal was set upon all His preparation. The voice from heaven and the fluttering dove were signs of something that happened in His own soul. His work, the saving of a sinful world, was ready for Him, and He was ready for the work. Alone in the wilderness He went and fought His great battle of final renunciation of all that might hinder or prevent His firm following of the way of God. He came forth Conqueror, to live and die that He might bring the world to the Father.

With that crisis, that dedication made perfect through strength and victory, we may say that Jesus' education was complete.

It had been long—thirty years. It had been quiet: what had there been here that was not ordinary? The Apocryphal Gospels, written when the Church thirsted for unedifying marvels, told of miracles attending Jesus' childhood and youth. But they lied. The growing up of Jesus had been such as ours might be; only He was different from what we can ever be. Only through Him can we be like Him. It was for that He came, for that He lived, and died, and conquered.]

We may do well to think more earnestly than we have perhaps often done about this story of Jesus' education; because these things, no less

than the rest in the wonderful story, are written for our example. As we think about our task and duty of leading the children into the company of the Lord, as we stand among all the baffling difficulties that seem to beset us when we attempt the task of helping the children to grow up as Christians indeed, some light may come to us from the story.

Take these things, these which we can be sure of, which went to the making of the perfect manhood of Jesus as its conditions, and does it not seem that they are all of them conditions which we ought to strive to put around the children whom we covet for Christ, as those through which they may most fitly and surely come to that manhood and womanhood which is the will of God for them in Christ Jesus?

That the children should have holy and happy homes, into which they are welcomed by the love of mothers and fathers who love God still more, where they are prayed for as earnestly as they are cared for, where they may learn glad obedience, and self-denying comradeship:

That the children should grow up to know the need and the delight of simple work; free from the curse of poverty, but free from the greater curse of luxury and idleness:

That the children should learn, by seeing, to love

the beauty and order of the natural world that God has provided for their home, and read there the truths of His eternal government; and that, for this, they should be free to their share in fresh air and green fields:

That the children should have all chance of knowing, as best it can be taught them, the facts of the world's history and present needs as they are related to the part they have to play in its affairs; that they should all have full opportunity of the widest and wisest 'secular' education:

That the children should be nurtured in the religious tradition of the people of God; taught to know and love, with understanding, all that increasing revelation that God has given to His Church in trust—and to rejoice in the Church's worship and fellowship:

That the children should grow up to watch for and to grasp the hour of their opportunity when they may find a purpose and will of God for them to which they may dedicate their whole self:

These are principles of education which time does not change; they are foundation principles. And we may do something by prayer and labour to bring them to realization for all who are born into this world.

Entre Nous.

Hastings Rashdall.

It would have been difficult for any one person to deal adequately with the life of that outstanding figure among Modernists, Hastings Rashdall. The unity which is necessary to a well-written life has been excellently preserved in this case—*The Life of Hastings Rashdall, D.D.* (Milford; 18s. net)—by the giving of the work to a colleague of his own, Mr. P. E. Matheson, a Fellow of New College. His intimate knowledge of Rashdall's years at Oxford as student, and later as Tutor and Fellow, enables him to make these periods full of interest. But Mr. Matheson felt that to deal adequately with Rashdall's many-sidedness as historian, philosopher, and theologian, and to present an equally vivid picture of his time as Canon of Hereford and the last phase of his life as Dean of Carlisle, he must call in the help of others, and so the value of the life is enhanced by the chapters contributed by

Professor C. C. J. Webb, by the present Canon of Hereford, the Venerable Archdeacon Lilley, by Chancellor Campbell of Carlisle, and by Mr. Summers, who was a Congregational minister in Carlisle from 1912 to 1921. The last gives an attractive picture of the relations which existed between the Dean and his Nonconformist brethren. He instituted a bimonthly fraternal, which was attended by ten Anglicans and ten Nonconformists.

Mr. Matheson's task was not made easier by the fact that the bulk of the letters to which he had access were those which Rashdall wrote to his mother. They covered practically the whole of his life, since she died as a very old lady only a short time before himself, and they are apt to contain lists of events, an account of his movements, rather than any statement of thought. Nor does he appear to have had that gift of lightness and humour

in letter-writing which made him such an excellent conversationalist.

Hastings Rashdall was born in 1858. He was named, by the wish of his grandmother Mrs. Rashdall, after her brother Mr. Hastings Bonner. He was the son of John Rashdall of whom Tennyson wrote: 'Early in 1852 my father and mother went on a visit to one of his old college friends, Mr. Rashdall, the clergyman of Malvern, and met the Carlyles and Sydney Dobell. Rashdall was a man so beloved by his parishioners and so simple and direct in his language from the pulpit that he had emptied the Dissenting Chapels for miles round.' As a child Rashdall showed a religious bent. 'Once the maid came to Mrs. Rashdall with a grave face, saying, "Master Hastings had been so long at his prayers, Ma'am, and I don't like to interrupt him." He loved to attend the daily services at St. Mark's, the district church, and, on one occasion, when a churching was to take place, and the clerk did not appear, the boy escaped from his nurse, knelt down by the woman, and repeated all the responses in a loud voice.' He was educated at Harrow. It is said that Dr. Butler, when asked whom he considered his most distinguished pupil, replied, 'It is not easy to say, but if you press me, I think—Rashdall.' From Harrow he went to New College, Oxford. When he left Oxford he carried away with him 'a strong bent for philosophical and theological study, and had laid the foundation for his principles in ethics and metaphysics.' For a short time he lectured at St. David's College, Lampeter, then followed a tutorship at University College, Durham. He was ordained in June 1884 by Bishop Westcott. We next find him back again at his beloved Alma Mater. This return was made possible by a fellowship at Hertford. At this time he instituted a society to discuss religious and philosophical questions. It was attended by, among others, Vernon Bartlet, Fairbairn, the present Dean of St. Paul's, the present Bishops of Carlisle, Manchester, and Pretoria, Percy Gardner, C. C. J. Webb, and B. H. Streeter. In 1894 he succeeded Canon Freemantle as Chaplain and Theological Fellow at Balliol. In 1895 he was appointed Fellow and Tutor of New College. To this period belongs the publication of the first of his three great books, 'The Universities of the Middle Ages.' 'The book contained a declaration of faith which went far beyond college life: it laid down the lines on which his later books, *The Theory of Good and Evil* and *The Atonement*, were to be written, and the policy which determined his whole attitude to religious questions and to the Church of England.

The supreme value of personal teaching, the policy of spontaneous development and adaptation, the demand for intellectual freedom, the hatred of obscurantism, and the rejection of false claims of authority—these are the governing ideas of life which seem to emerge from the varied and fascinating pages.' He was an inspiring teacher, and entirely sincere and outspoken and full of enthusiasm. One pupil wrote that he 'did me the honour of holding forth at me alone for an hour, vehemently confuting all the heresies I had been advocating in my essays. He was determined that I should take the Kingdom of Heaven by storm, even vicariously by *his* violence, in spite of *my* perversity.' He felt himself that his position was not without difficulty. 'You see,' he said on one occasion, 'I am on the left wing of the Church and the right wing of the philosopher.'

'A girl student whom he had kindly consented to coach in philosophy, as she was the niece of a friend, records her delight in his lectures, especially those on Kant, and her terror at her coachings in his study; how he would come in rather late, "at express speed," and put a question and walk round the study, inspecting his bookshelves or winding the clock while he waited for the answer from his nervous pupil, and how he overcame her shyness at lunch or tea with stories of Jowett and other notabilities; and how, when she apologized for her stupidity on some occasion, he replied, "I assure you I notice nothing out of the ordinary."'

He is stated at this time—1895—to be 'a figure rather below the middle height, grave thoughtful eyes with shaggy eyebrows, and set in a large head with a massive brow rising into a domelike top. The face in repose, as in all the portraits, was grave and sometimes sad, but was at once lit up with merriment and brightness by any stroke of humour. As time went on his hair grew rapidly thinner, and his colleagues watched with interest the care with which his last remaining lock was trained over his baldness.' An interesting pen portrait by Mr. W. J. Barton, a Winchester scholar, who visited Italy with him, begins in this way: 'I had known him fairly well for six months, for we lived on the same stair. As undergraduates will, I had regarded him half as a joke. It was only on this journey that I learnt he was a great man. There was plenty to smile at still, but all my thoughts of him were afterwards coloured by my discovery of his deep piety. In Paris, Florence, Milan, he would never miss Sunday Communion and Matins, though we always ran, and were late. I was astonished at the length and intensity of his morning and evening

prayers, and then first appreciated his regard for institutional Christianity.'

In 1910 he was appointed to a Canonry at Hereford, and the Venerable Archdeacon Lilley writes: 'It is hardly necessary to say how we felt, and I think delighted in, the bigness of the man at our Chapter meetings. The business of a Cathedral Chapter is never very exciting, and much of it is necessarily a matter of routine. But even in the veriest matter of routine principle may be involved, sometimes deeply involved. And Rashdall was a man of principle. Nothing offended him so much as intellectual slovenliness. He would sit silent, indrawn rather than withdrawn, through a long discussion only to startle us with a sudden intervention, it might be only a pointed question, which lifted some matter that had seemed to us one of mere custom or expediency on to the higher ground of principle. Rashdall was of course an intellectualist, but his intellectualism had always moral roots.'

In 1917 he entered upon the last phase, being appointed Dean of Carlisle in that year.

A gloom was cast on the last years by a storm of criticism aroused by an address which he gave at Girton on Christ as Logos and Son of God. The position that he took up was that Christ had not claimed Divinity for Himself, but he was reported as having denied the Divinity of Christ. His exact position with regard to the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Trinity, he made abundantly clear in his Bampton Lectures, 'The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology,' and in his massive work in two volumes on 'The Theory of Good and Evil.' It is not possible here to summarize these. It might, however, be noted that a volume of *Ideas and Ideals*, compiled from the Dean's literary remains, has been issued by Mr. Basil Blackwell at the modest price of 6s. net. One of these essays contains a clear though brief statement of his position with regard to the Atonement, and another, 'The Scholastic Theology,' of his doctrine of the Trinity.

'A True Christian.'

'The Deanery was a centre of intellectual and spiritual life for the city and neighbourhood. From it went out kind thoughts and deeds for all who were in trouble or need, without distinction of persons. "Why," said some one in the street in the time of the attack on him, "you have only to watch the man's life to know he is a true Christian."

'A verger was heard to say: "When my son came home wounded from France the Dean was

one of the first to call and see him. He sat down in my cottage and smoked a cigarette with us, just as if he was anybody at all." The evidence of his friendship with the poor is abundant. One friend wrote after his death: "One of the very poor said to me two or three years ago, 'Oh, miss, you don't know what he's done. He's brought Christ and Christ's ways to the door of the working man here.'" Another friend records how the Dean would cycle out to country churches in Cumberland to take services for clergy who could not afford a substitute. And the courage with which he went on with his work amid the terrible pain and discomfort of his illness was a lesson to all. His slips of absent-mindedness made him the dearer. "Oh, never mind," said a verger, "his feet are on the ground, his head is in the sky, but his heart is in the right place."¹

The next number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES starts a new volume. Articles of special interest have been arranged. The series on leaders of religious thought will include an account of Archbishop Söderblom, by Professor M. Tor Andrae of Upsala; of Wilfred Monod, by Pastor A. N. Bertrand of Paris, in collaboration with Professor Merle d' Aubigné; of Deissmann, by Professor Curtis, Edinburgh; of Loofs, by Professor Hugh Watt, Edinburgh; of Father Tyrrell, by Mr. Will Spens. Articles on the Gospel for India, dealing with Indian receptivity in respect of Christian teaching on the Incarnation, Salvation, Knowledge of God, Attitude to Life and Immortality, are to be contributed by Principal W. S. Urquhart. Canon A. E. J. Rawlinson's 'Recent Work on the Life of Jesus' will also appear shortly, and a new series of articles will appear on 'Books that have left their mark on our Epoch.' Fuller announcements will be made later.

The editors are open to receive not only articles but also contributions for 'Virginibus Puerisque.' All such contributions should be sent direct to Kings Gate, Aberdeen.

¹ P. E. Matheson, *The Life of Hastings Rashdall*, D.D., 238.